

*Theology vol 81.*

Some INSTANCES  
OF THE  
DEFECTS and OMISSIONS  
IN  
Mr. *WHISTON*'s  
Collection of Testimonies  
FROM THE  
SCRIPTURES and the FATHERS,  
Against the  
True DEITY of the SON,  
AND THE  
HOLY GHOST;  
And of Mis-applying and Mis-interpreting  
divers of them.

---

By Dr. G R A B E. *K*

---

To which is premised  
A DISCOURSE, wherein some Account is  
given of the learned DOCTOR, and of his  
MSS. and of this short Tract found among  
his English MSS.

---

By GEORGE HICKES, D. D.

---

L O N D O N,  
Printed by W. BOWYER, for HENRY CLEMENTS, at the  
*Half-Moon* in *St. Paul's Church-yard*, 1712.





A  
DISCOURSE

*Wherein some Account is given of  
Dr. GRABE, and of his MSS,  
and of the following TRACT.*

**T**Hough I always thought Dr. John Ernest Grabe, while he lived, the greatest Divine I ever had the Happiness to converse with, as well as the most easie, free, and useful in his Conversation; yet after I had viewed the MSS he left behind him, I perceived he was a greater Master, than before I apprehended he was. And in truth I can compare him to nothing more aptly, than to a great and mighty Prince, who dying, leaves behind him many Plans, of noble and curious Buildings; Foundations of others; others erected above Ground; some half, others almost, and others perfectly finished. Such are the Remains left us by this great Master-builder. Of which the curious among the learned may shortly see an Account, in two fair Catalogues of his MSS; one of which will be lodged by his Executors,

iv      *Some Account of Dr. GRABE,*

*Monsieur Bonet, the King of Prussia's Resident in England, and Mr. Nelson, (for whom he had a singular Love and Esteem,) in the Bodleian Library at Oxford, to which he finally bequeathed them; and the other, in that most noble and curious Storehouse of MSS, as well as Printed Books, collected with great Care and Cost, by the Right Honourable Robert, Earl of Oxford, Lord High Treasurer of England, the great Master and Encourager of Learning, and Patron of all learned Men; who knew the great Worth of Dr. Grabe, as well as any of the most learned who conversed or corresponded with him in our own, or any other Country, and who in a most particular manner was a true <sup>a</sup> Mécenas to him; and therefore he very seldom mentioned his Lordship without Expressions of Honour, as a Person of the greatest Attainments in Learning, or without the just Sense of that Gratitude he had for him, as his Benefactor, even upon his Death-bed.*

*All the Works he published in his Life-time, the Learned know very well; and also what great Benefit the Church hath received by them. But because many, who will have no Opportunity of seeing the Catalogue of his MSS, will, I doubt not, be glad to know what they are, to gratifie their Desires, and more especially such of them as retain a Veneration for him, I will here mention some of those valuable Remains.*

---

<sup>a</sup> See his Dedication of his DISSERTATIO de variis Vitiis LXX interpretum Versione illatis.

and of his Manuscripts, &c. v

The two remaining Vol. of the Alexandrian Text of the LXX, complete, containing the Historical and Prophetical Books, with very large Corrections for a Vol. of Annotations, as also for <sup>u</sup> some curious Dissertations, Prologomena, &c. <sup>e</sup> upon the four Volumes. But the Collations out of some foreign MSS, with the Marks of the Origenian Asterisks, and Obelisks, which <sup>b</sup> he <sup>s</sup> thought so very valuable, are not among them; but his worthy Executors answerably to their great trust are endeavouring to procure them, and will take care for the benefit of the learned World, to complete and publish this great Work.

The Alexandrian Texts of the N. Test. and of St. Clement's Epistles, first published by Junius, with Notes. He never discovered his design of printing this Work, which will perfect the whole Alexandrian MS, least he should prejudice the Sale of his Friend Dr. Mills N. Testament.

The two Vol. of his Spicilegium revised, and corrected in many places, with large Additions, and Collections for continuing the same, which he designed to do in a third Volume, wherein, as he tells us in the Margin of p. 17. of this Tract, he intended to publish a fragment of one of St. Clement's lost Books, in which he calls the Holy Ghost Θεός, God.

His Irenæus revised, and corrected with Collections, and References for a new Edition, in which he designed to animadvert upon the lear-

---

<sup>b</sup> Preface to his Essay on the two Arabick MSS, p. 3.

vi    *Some Account of Dr. GRABE,*  
*ned<sup>c</sup> Editor of the new Paris-Edition of that*  
*Father, MDCCX, in his own Defence.*

*Many Greek Fragments of Origen, particularly out of his Commentaries, containing an hundred and twenty Sheets in 4<sup>to</sup>, and five in Folio. There are among his MSS, a numerous Collection of other most curious and useful Greek Fragments of Fathers, and some of Hereticks, which would make several Vol. in Print for the benefit of the learned World, of all which there is an Account in the Catalogue above-mentioned, and it is with some difficulty I forbear to give Specimens of some of them.*

*Amongst his Plans, there is one in Latin, entitled, ANGLICANÆ ECCLESIAE prærogativæ præ aliis protestantium Coetibus in Praxi & Doctrina speciatim. The Titles of the Chapters of this intended Treatise, are these which follow in his own words.*

*In Hierarchiâ Ecclesiasticâ & Episcoporum continuâ ab Apostolis successionem, & legitimâ Sacerdotum Ordinationem, Cap. 1.*

*In celebratione Eucharistiæ: ubi de oblatione panis & vini, illiusque fermentati, de benedictione, de gratiarum actione atque precibus, de fractione panis, necnon de ipso Sacerdote primam Oblatorum partem sumente agitur, Cap. 2.*

*In administratione Confirmationis per manuum impositionem, quam Apostolus in Epistola ad Hebræos, Cap. vi. v. 2. inter fundamenta*



Christianæ Religionis refert, de quô hoc loco prolixè agitur, Cap. 3.

In Ritibus quibusdam communiter observatis, ut sunt memoriæ Apostolorum, Evangelistarum, omniumque Sanctorum, Signum Crucis, Genu-flexio in Precibus, Recitatio Psalmorum *Davidis*, & Lectio Bibliorum in matutino & vespertino Cultu, Cap. 4.

In Ritibus quibusdam, haud semper quidem & ubique in Ecclesiâ Anglicanâ observatis, at tamen bene commendatis in Liturgiâ Anglicanâ, ut sunt immersio baptizandorum in aquam, jejunium Quadragesimale, aliaque statâ Jejunia, Cap. 5.

In moderatione, quæ in formandis Articulis Fidei five Doctrinæ Anglicanæ est adhibita, indeque pendente majori Conscientiæ libertate, Cap. 6.

In Catechismo, speciatim in restitutione secundi Præcepti Divini de imaginibus Dei haud formandis atque adorandis, quod in *Lutheri* perinde ut in Romano Catechismo est omis- sum, Cap. 7.

Speciatim in Articulo de Justificatione & Prædestinatione, ubi obscurior *Pauli* disputatio de Justificatione declaratur, & clara *Jacobi* in hoc Articulo Doctrina ex aliis Scripturæ locis confirmatur, ac ostenditur quàm malè *Jacobus* à *Luthero* Delirii accusatus, ejusque Epistola Straminea vocata fuerit, & quàm miserè ab aliis planus ejus sensus pervertatur, Cap. 8.



viii *Some Account of Dr. GRABE,*

In aliis quibusdam punctis, veluti de Potestate Ecclesiæ circa leges in adiaphoris ferendas, Cap. 9.

In veneratione erga universalem Patrum consensum & Catholicam Ecclesiæ traditionem, quodque nec *Lutheri* nec *Calvini* placitis ita strictè adhæreat, multò minùs more Hæreticorum & Schismaticorum se à quoquam singulari homine denominet, uti *Lutherani* semetipsos ita à *Luthero* vocant, planè contrà Apostoli *Pauli*, & Apostolicæ Ecclesiæ doctrinam atque praxin, Cap. 10.

*I have set down these Titles to shew what a singular Esteem he had for the Church of England above all other reformed Churches, and to take occasion to tell the World, that upon his Death-bed, he desired it might be known that he dyed in her Faith and Communion, which he thought a pure and a sound part of the Catholick Church. But then after these Heads he hath written in Capitals DESIDERATA.*

*For it cannot be denied, but that he was for restoring the pure Primitive Practices and Discipline of the Catholick Churches, which continued more or less corrected in all Churches till the Reformation. In the eleventh Page of his Preface to his Essay upon the two Arabick MSS, he commends Mr. W. for declaring himself against the Abuses or Defects of particular Churches, whether Romanist, or Reformed, or both, where he hath on his Side not only the Consent of many other Christian Nations, but also*  
the

the ancient Church over all the World, besides the plain Testimonies of Scriptures, as namely, Baptism by bare sprinkling; the not mixing Water with Wine in the Cup of the Lord's Supper; as also the eating of Blood and things strangled, of which, and the like <sup>d</sup> (*saieth he*) any Christian Divine may, and ought to speak or write his Mind freely, as Occasion offers, or Necessity requires. *This was his own Temper, he wanted not Courage to assert the ancient Catholick Usages of all Churches, and therefore he never made any difficulty of telling his Mind with a truly Christian Parrhesia of the Oblation of Bread and Wine, and the Prayer of Invocation to God the Father in the Consecration, to send down his Holy Spirit upon them, that they might be unto the Communicants [in the Mystical Sense] the Body and Blood of his Son Jesus Christ, not in Substance, but in Grace and Virtue, as in the ancient Liturgies, for the remission of their Sins; for their Confirmation in Godliness; for the Benefit of their Souls and Bodies; for the Communication of the Holy Ghost; for sure Trust and Confidence in God, and for the Resurrection unto Life eternal. For the same reason he never was afraid to declare his Mind freely for the Practise of Chrism in Confirmation; for anointing the Sick with Oyl, for Confession and Sacerdotal Absolution, as judicial, for Prayer for the Souls of the dead, who dyed in the Faith*

---

<sup>d</sup> See p. 21. near the bottom.

®  
x      *Some Account of Dr. GRAVE,*  
*and Fear of God; for the ancient Commemora-*  
*tion of Saints in the Holy Eucharist; of all*  
*which there are short Memorandums and Hints*  
*under the Deliderata mentioned above: And*  
*as he used to speak of the want of these things,*  
*as Defects in the Reformed Churches; so it was*  
*not without Sorrow and some Indignation that he*  
*used to lament the Corruption and Depravation*  
*of them in the Church of Rome, to which his*  
*great Love and Zeal for pure ancient Christi-*  
*ty, would no more let him be reconciled, than*  
*any of those Martyrs, who for bearing their Te-*  
*stimony against her intolerable Errors, have here*  
*or elsewhere resisted unto Blood. Hence it is*  
*that among his MSS, I find several finished or*  
*unfinished, written against the Errors and Cor-*  
*rptions of the Church of Rome, whose Titles*  
*are as follow.*

De Articulis fidei non multiplicandis, five de  
fidei Symbolo perfecto contra Pontificios.

Schismatis inter Græcos & Latinos causa,  
pro Græcis contra Latinos.

De Cathedrâ S. Petri, five de verâ Catholicæ  
Ecclesiæ unitate, contra Pontificios.

Petrus non Monarcha, five discursus de quæ-  
stione, utrùm Petrus Monarchicum Ecclesiæ  
caput fuerit. In quo Pontificiorum argumenta  
pro affirmativâ parte hujus quæstionis dissol-  
vuntur.

Petrus non Petra, five Petrus à Petrâ, non  
Petra à Petro.

Romanæ Ecclesiæ & Ethnicæ Religionis si-  
militudo & convenientia. De

De *Idololatriâ* Tractatus. In specie de crimine *Idololatriæ*, cujus Romanam Ecclesiam *Protestantes* accusant, eamque hoc respectu *Babylonicam Meretricem* S. *Johanni* divinitus ostensam esse dicunt, differitur.

*Nova Babylon*, five de corrupto Ecclesiæ statu. In specie de Romanæ Ecclesiæ Adulterio.

Testimonia de Corruptione Ecclesiæ Romanæ quoad Dogmatica.

Dissertatio contra Communionem Eucharisticam sub unâ *Panis* Specie in Romanâ Ecclesiâ usitatam.

De communione sub utrâque *Panis*, & *Vini* specie, contra Pontificios.

Roma *Meretrix*. Sive Testimonia, quòd sub finem Mundi à verâ fide in Christum deficiens magnam in Religione corruptionem sit admiffura. Quòdque sedes Antichristi tandem Roma futura sit.

Argumenta quòd Ecclesiæ Romanæ fornicatio spiritualis non sit propriè cultus *Antichristianus*, sed præcedens Apostasia tantum.

*With these I may mention several of his Letters found among his Papers, which he wrote with success to several Persons, to prevent their Apostacy from the Church of England to the Church of Rome, when they were ready to be reconciled to it. In these Letters he challenged the Priests to meet him at Conferences before the Persons they had led astray: But they knowing the Hercules with whom they must have conflicted, wisely declined the Challenge; for they could*



xii    *Some Account of Dr. GRABE,*

not but be sensible, that he was prepared to demonstrate all the Errors and Corruptions of their Church, both in Doctrine and Practice, from the pure Doctrines and Practices of the ancient Catholick Church, which as it is the most effectual and unanswerable way of managing the Controversie with the Popish Emissaries and Writers, so it is that which they most fear. I might here add how Popish Writers, in particular Father Mossuet before mentioned, ascribes his writing against their Church, to his being joined to the Church of England.

But I have said enough, indeed more than enough, to vindicate Dr. Grabe's good Name, and the Honour of his Memory from the slander of being enclined to Popery, among Persons of true Ingenuity and Knowledge, who in all Instances understand the true Difference between pure ancient Christianity, and the Depravations and Corruptions of it in the Church of Rome, and who consequently must be the most competent Judges (to use his Word) of the Desiderata in all the Reformations from that most degenerate Church. But then there are another sort of Men, who out of their Ignorance of the Usages of pure ancient Christianity, or out of Party-ill-Will, or both, cannot forbear to misrepresent such Men as are for restoring almost any of them to the Reformed Churches, as Popishly affected and inclined. How hath the Church of England her self been slandered as Popish, by her Adversaries for retaining Episcopacy, Sacerdotal Vestments, and the Sign of the Cross in Baptism, &c. ? And how

how was Archbishop Laud charged with Popery, and persecuted even to Death upon the account of the Prayer of Oblation, and Consecration in the Office in the Holy Communion which is in the Scottish Liturgy? I say, persecuted to Death; for in Conversation with many that have been Enemies to his good Name, they have acknowledged he had not been prosecuted unto Blood, but upon that Account. No ouvert Acts to the contrary: Not his admirable Book against Fisher the Jesuit, not his discovering a Popish Plot, not the general Odium of the Papists, not their rejoicing at his Fall, nor his last Speech on the Scaffold, will ever acquit him amongst these sorts of Protestants, any more than his Martyr'd Sovereign, from the Imputation of Popery, with which they will be slandered by such virulent Enemies to the Day of Judgment. I am sorry to say there have been, and still are, such Men among the Clergy, who either will never mention that great and most venerable Prelate with Honour, or else which is worse, they speak and write of him with Innuendos, or plain Reflections as affected to Popery, and a dangerous Innovator, and Introducer of Popish Rites. These are the Men, whom I have also long observed to be Enemies to the Memory of Mr. Thorndike, undervaluing his excellent Works in a most shameful manner, nay, sometimes ridiculing, and always decrying of them, to hinder the younger Clergy from reading of them, and learning in them the Discipline and Practises of the Universal Church. This sort of Men, however otherwise distin-

xiv *Some Account of Dr. GRABE,*

*distinguished, thus also treat the Memory of Dr. Grabe, particularly for having declared his Opinion for the Oblation of the Elements in the Holy Eucharist, and the Prayer of Invocation in the Consecration of them mentioned above. Of this he was wont to speak his Mind without reserve in all Companies, particularly in the Conference he had with Mr. Whiston, of which I find an Account among his Papers, and would publish it in this Discourse, but that he hath said enough in his own Vindication in his Essay upon the two Arabick MSS. It was with the same freedom that he used to lament the Alterations that were made in the Office for administering the Holy Communion in the first C. P. Book of K. Edward VI. which as I find by a Fragment among his English MSS. he designed to publish with Notes. Among his Papers and MSS, there is much more than I have mentioned to be found in proof of the Eucharistical Sacrifice, for maintaining of which I think it an Honour to have been, like the great Men mentioned before, persecuted by the Tongues and Pens of some Divines, and though in all Humility I acknowledge my self not worthy to be named among them, yet I rejoice, that I have been in some measure partaker of their Sufferings against all Candour, Justice and Humanity, for so Holy and Catholick a Truth. I have already vindicated my self in an <sup>f</sup> Answer to my first Adversary; but as to the*

---

<sup>e</sup> In my Discourse of the Christian Priesthood.

<sup>f</sup> In the Preface to my second Vol. of Controversial Letters.



other, Dr. Wise of Canterb. who hath written a Book against me, entituled, *The Christian Eucharist rightly stated, &c.* I make it my earnest Desire to all learned Men, more especially to those of the Clergy to read it and judge between us, and this is all the Reply I shall ever make to it. But then the Doctor must give me leave to tell him, that I have desired many learned Divines to read over his Book, but without the success I wished; for some of them told me they knew what was in him, and would not read it; some began to read it, and sent me word they were not able to proceed; and three of them, who read it through, though not privy to one another's reading of it, all sent me word in the same Phrase, that they had done Penance in reading over Dr. Wise's Book, and one of them in his Letter added, that the Dr. had written himself out of Reputation among the Clergy where he lived. I add this, to excite the Curiosity of the Learned to peruse it, and to help off the Impression, which in different respects will be a Kindness to the Doctor, as well as to me, for it hath hitherto laid in his Bookseller's Shop, and I fear will lye there, as an unvendible Drug.

I must also remind the Doctor, that I am under no Obligation to answer his Book, because he hath not produced the consenting Suffrage of all the ancient Cath. Church, to prove that the Eucharist is not a proper material Sacrifice, which he told his Auditors in his *8 Visitation-Sermon* he

---

<sup>a</sup> Entituled *The Faithful Stewards*, p. 14.



xvi *Some Account of Dr. GRABE,*

could add to a [*misapplied*] Testimony of St. Augustin, but that he had no place for it. This, and his Reflections on me and others in it, occasioned the writing of an <sup>h</sup> Answer to his Sermon, in which he was called upon again and again for this consentient Testimony of all the ancient Catholick Church. He was told by the Author of it, p. 1. that if he could shew it, he would promise for me, that I would retract what I had written upon that Subject, and that the Doctor should not object or pretend the great Labour of doing it for his Excuse, the Author also told him in the second Page, that it should suffice to direct to the Passages in the several Books of the ancient Ecclesiastical Writers, to make this consenting Suffrage appear. Farther, to encourage him to perform what he said he could do, he told him in the fifth Page, that it would be his glory to convince us of the other side by Antiquity, Universality, and Consent, against which we could not stand out. Again, in the 12<sup>th</sup> Page, to provoke him to the Performance, that Author told him he was bound in Honour to make out the consenting Suffrage of all the ancient Church, as he would not be thought a Gascon in the Controversie; and in the last Page told him again, that no notice should be taken of any Reply he should make, but what brought his consenting Suffrage along with it, which I stick not to say not only in that Author's Words, I am confident, but that

---

<sup>h</sup> Entituled, *A seasonable and modest Apology in behalf of Dr. George Hickes, and other Non-jurors, in a Letter to Th. Wise, D.D.*

I am sure, he can never do. But after his boasting, instead of shewing that he could do it, he entirely, and would it not look like a Childish Jest, I would have said, he wisely declines it; which demonstrates that he was not conversant in the Writings of the ancient Fathers, and Councils, when he was so vain as to make that boast, or if he was, that he made it against his Conscience, which in Charity I am not willing to believe. Thus, not versed in the Originals proper to decide the Controversie, he plunged into it before he rightly understood it, and how he hath since performed his part, I appeal to all learned Divines (learned I mean in the ancient Originals of their own Profession) and to that end, repeat my earnest Request to them to read the Doctor's Book.

But to return from this Digression to Dr. Grabe and his MSS, in this <sup>i</sup> Tract he declares it was his Intention to shew that the eight Books of the Apostolical Constitutions, are a Collection of the Didascalix of the Apostles, of Clemens Romanus, Hippolytus, and of the like ancient Writings put together, but strangely interpolated, and vitiated by an Arian, insomuch that he hath not scrupled to add whole Chapters, and to turn Affirmatives into Negatives, & vice versa: So in his Essay on the Arabick MSS, after declaring he was confirmed in his Opinion, by that of <sup>k</sup> Bp. Pearson, and by perusing the Doctrine of

<sup>i</sup> P. 21.

<sup>k</sup> See Bishop Pearson's Vindicia Epist. S. Ignat. from p. 58, to the end of p. 63.

xviii *Some Account of Dr. GRABE,*

the Apostles by Hippolytus, which is among the Baroccian MSS in the Bodleian Library, he adds, out of which the last Book of the Clementine Constitutions is made, the Compiler having added many things, and altered several Passages, insomuch that he hath contradicted Hippolytus. I have cited these Passages to let the Reader know, that among his MSS, there is a Copy of the Didascalia of Clemens Romanus, and of Hippolytus, with Copies of other MSS, which he had transcribed and collected towards a 1<sup>st</sup> third Vol. of his Spicilegium; and to shew, that the Clementine Constitutions were not written by the Apostles, <sup>m</sup> but was a patched Work out of the DIDASCALIAE, or Doctrines, which went under the Names of the H. Apostles, and their Successors.

The first of these I take to be that Copy amongst the Doctors MSS, which is entituled, *Ἀγαπαὶ αἱ διὰ ΚΛΗΜΕΝΤΟΣ, καὶ ἡγόνες τῶν Ἀγίων Ἀποστόλων.* It begins *Χαίρετε υἱοὶ καὶ θυγατέρες ἐν ὀνόματι Κυρίου Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ. Ἰωάννης καὶ Ματθαῖος, &c.* It is a fair but faulty Copy, or transcribed from a faulty Copy. He hath not noted from whence this Copy is transcribed, but at the end of it he hath written as follows: *Quæritur an post hæc immediatè sequantur τὰ πρὸς ἡγόνων Ἐκκλησιαστικῶν ΣΙΜΩΝΟΣ καὶ Καρανάη, ut in Lambec. Num. 4. quæ Cap. 28. Const. extant. He means Cap. 28. of the viii<sup>th</sup>*

<sup>1</sup> P. 14.

<sup>m</sup> Essay, p. 4. 25.



Book. After which, some other short Memorandums are written for his own use. According to this MS, Martha and Mary were admitted to speak in this Council among the Apostles after St. John as follows.

Ἰωάννης εἶπεν,

ἡ Ἐπελαθέσθαι ἀδελφοὶ ὅτε ὁ ἦτοσε ὁ διδάσκαλος  
τὸ ἄρτον καὶ τὸ ποτήριον καὶ εὐλόγησεν αὐτὰ λέγων, τῷ  
τό ἐστι τὸ σῶμα μου, καὶ τὸ αἷμα, ὅτι ἐκ τῆς ὀψίτρεψε  
ταῦτα συστῆναι ἡμῖν.

Μάρθα εἶπεν,

Μάρθα εἶπεν διὰ Μαριάμ, ὅτι εἶδεν αὐτῷ ἡ μη-  
διῶς.

Μαρία εἶπεν,

Οὐκ ἐπ' ἐγέλασα· παρελέγετο γὰρ ἡμῖν ὅτι ἐδίδασκεν·  
ὅτι τὸ ἀδελφὸς διὰ τῆς ἰσχυρῆς σωδῆπται.

But these Sayings of the two Sisters, as they do not well agree with 1 Cor. xiv. 34. so neither with the fifth Chapter of the third Book of the printed Constitutions, and therefore the Compiler of them thought fit to pass them over, tho' he has put into his Book so many other Passages of this MS, as is evident from the first five or six Chapters of the vii<sup>th</sup> Book, where they are abridg'd.

The other MS has indors'd upon it,

Περὶ χειρισμάτων Ἀποστολικὴ ᾠδή· διὰ Ἰπ-  
πολύτη. It is translated into Latin, and appears

\* Forſan pro ἐπιλαθέσθαι.

ο Forſan pro ἔλαβε.

ρ Forſan pro ἐπετρεψε.

\* Pro Μειδιῶσαν



xx *Some Account of Dr. GRABE,*  
*to be copy'd from one of the Baroccian MS in*  
*the Bodleian Library by these words in the Mar-*  
*gin, (Codex MS. Baroc. num. 26.) written in*  
*the Transcriber's hand. But on the top of the*  
*first Page is written in the Dr's own running hand,*  
*Præcedit in eodem Cod. Doctrina omnium A-*  
*postolorum* *Ἐν χειρῶν.* And also, *Διδα-*  
*σκαλία τῶν ἁγίων ἀποστόλων, π. χ. Vindeb.* And o-  
 ver the Title of the first Chapter, Titulus in  
 MS. Vind.

From all which it appears, that this Copy of  
 the Baroccian MS has been compar'd with that  
 in the Emperor's Library at Vienna; and the Dr.  
 hath mark'd in it upon the Margin, how the Or-  
 der of the Chapters is transpos'd in the Printed  
 Constitutions; as that the first in the MS is the  
 fourth in the Print, the second in the MS the  
 fifth in the Print, the third the sixteenth, &c.  
 He hath also observ'd most of the different rea-  
 dings in the MS and printed Constitutions. And  
 it is to be observed that this transposing of the  
 Chapters of the MS in the viii<sup>th</sup> Book of the  
 Printed Constitutions, proceeds from the Inter-  
 polation of so many Chapters in it, and leaving  
 some out.

Of the other MSS relating to Mr. Whiston's  
 new Scriptures, the Apostolical Constitutions by  
 St. Clement, one is inscribed, "Ὁρῶντες τῶν  
 ἁγίων ἀποστόλων, and the same Words are writ-  
 ten in the Endorsement, and after them, &c.

---

<sup>1</sup> P. 146. b. ut & in Vindeb.

and then N. 7, 8, 9. Under N. 7. are contained 17 Canons, each of which are marked with a Numerical Greek Letter; under N. 8. is written, ἐκ τῶν κεφαλῶν τῆς Διατάξεως περὶ Ἐπισκόπων, the whole containing 30 Canons, whereof the four last are περὶ ὑποφωρῶν. Then follows a single Canon, περὶ τῆς μὴ ποιῆν ἱερέα λειτουργίας δύν; then N. 9. ἐκ τῶν Ἀπιστολικῶν διαταγμάτων, Lib. 4. c. 6. Of which Διατάγματα, I suppose, the Collator writes thus: Numb. 8. containeth the 6, 7, and 9 Chapters of the 4<sup>th</sup> Book, as we have them printed. The rest you'll find out to be the common Sense and Style of several other Places of the Institutions.

Then it follows. N. 6. is only some various readings of the 32<sup>d</sup> Chap. of the 8<sup>th</sup> Book, divided into 87 Canons, &c.

Another of them is entituled ΑΙ ΕΝΤΟΛΑΙ. These ἐντολαὶ are 16 in number, being all marked with numeral Letters. They are collated with the Writings of the Fathers, out of which they are taken; as Clemens Alexandr. Irenæus, Athanasius, Antiochus, but more especially out of the two last. And the Collations with many various Lectiōns are also ranged all along the MS. in the Margin, and on the Cover which is Paper, is written in the Dr's hand: Sed confer MS. Codicem Homiliarum Antiochi, qui Anno Domini 1290 exaratus est, & habetur inter MSS. Libros Bodleianos, Laud. C. 91. Item alium inter Huntingtonianos, Num. 457. Juxta præsentem Ordinem.

xxii *Some Account of Dr. GRABE,*

*Another of these MSS is thus inscribed, Libri viii. Constitutionem Apostolicarum Clementis Collati cum duobus MSS, Codd. Vindebonensibus, Num. 46 & 47, juxta Lambecium, Lib. viii. Commentar. de Bibliotheca Vindebon. Then follows Codex vetustior hic notatur, Num. 1. Codex 47. Num. 2. Another is a Collation of the Apost. Const. with a Syriac MS. and is thus inscribed in the Dr's hand: Auctorem Libri viii. Constit. Apost. Clementis interpolasse partim, partim decurtasse Didascaliam Apostolorum probatur ex textibus Syriacæ Doctrinæ Apostolorum ab Ecchellensi allegatis. This is followed by another Collation in these Words, Collatio Citationum Anastasii cum MS. Cod. Baroc. 206. In the Margin is written, Codex primis quæstionibus est mutilatus. It appears from the Endorsement of the Paper Cover, in which these three MSS are put, that the Syriac Text of the Apost. Const. in Lambecius's Commentar. &c. was also collated with a Baroccian MS in the Bodleian Library, as well as with the MS in the Emperor's Library at Vienna.*

Besides these five MSS, there is a single Paper, containing a short Extract in French, out of Wanslebius's History of the Church of Alexandria, printed in 12<sup>o</sup> at Paris 1677, Part 5. C. I. To these I may add another MS, which is a Transcript with a Latin Translation, of a Fragment of the State of the Dead, out of the Book, entituled the Book of Josephus,  $\pi\epsilon\iota\tau\iota\tau\epsilon\varsigma\ \tau\omicron\ \sigma\tau\alpha\tau\omicron\varsigma\ \alpha\upsilon\tau\iota\alpha\varsigma$ , but ascribed by many learned Men

to <sup>f</sup> Hippolytus. It is reasonable to believe that the Compiler of the Pseudo-Clementine Constitutions, made use also of this MS. For if we compare the Prayer for the Faithful departed, Lib.8. Cap.41. with the 3<sup>d</sup>, 4<sup>th</sup>, and 6<sup>th</sup> §. of the MS, we shall find the description in both of the happy Place of Custody, where the Souls of the faithful rest in a joyful Expectation of their Resurrection, to be in Substance the same, and like to one another.

These are the Materials, which the great Man had collected towards the Work, in which he intended to prove, that the Apostolical Constitutions was a piece of Patch-work, or a Collection out of the Didascalia of the Apostles; Clemens Romanus, Hippolytus, &c. in Answer to Mr. Whiston. And I thought fit to give this publick Account of them, that if any learned Person is about an Answer, to Mr.W. he will not be denied the reasonable use of them; or otherwise, to encourage some learned Man, for the Service of Truth, to undertake so good and rewardable a Work.

But before I conclude this short Account of my now happy Friend's MSS, I must beg leave of the curious Reader to acquaint him with some things I find among his Papers, and in his printed Books, which shew his most free and communicable Temper without reserve, in imparting every thing he knew to any other Person, for the good of the Church, and the benefit of the lear-

---

<sup>f</sup> See Dr. Cave's *Historia Literaria* in Josephus and Hippolytus.



xxiv *Some Account of Dr. GRABE,*

*ned World. Among his English MSS, there is one containing Remarks upon the Epistles of Clemens Romanus, Polycarp, Ignatius, and upon the Shepherd of Hermas, which he communicated to the Lord Bishop of Lincoln, who not only in the Preface of the second Edition of his Translation of those Apostolical Fathers, but in a Letter, which his Lordship wrote for that purpose to the Doctor, gratefully and honourably acknowledges the great Obligation he had to him for them. In his last Will and Testament he ordered some few Notes he had written on Clemens Alexandr. to be sent to Dr. Potter, the Queen's learned Professor of Divinity at Oxford. He also began to write Notes upon Dr. Wells's Paraphrase of the Epistles, which, I doubt not when he had finished, he would have communicated to that learned Gentleman, to whom I think I should not be just, if I did not acknowledge the eminent Services he hath done to the Commonwealth of Learning, as a Humanist, and to God and his Church, as a Divine. He hath made some Remarks on the Propitiatory Oblation in the H. Eucharist, which I suppose he intended to communicate to the learned Author. He hath also left some Emendanda, and Addenda to the great and admirable Work of Dr. Cave's HISTORIA LITERARIA, which if he did not communicate, I question not, but he did intend to communicate them to him; and had Dr. Mill survived him, he would have acknowledged to the World, as  
he*

he did to me and others, the many, ready, and generous Assistances he received from him in his great Work. The learned Bp. Bull, as long as he lived, on all occasions acknowledged his singular Generosity, as well as Learning, in publishing his Works with so much Improvement and Advantage to the great Truths he had defended, and to the learned World. If I have enlarged a little too much upon his free Temper in communicating his Knowledge upon all Subjects to others, it is for the sake of those learned Men, who are apt to keep their great Talents to themselves, as it were wrapt up in a Napkin, or as the MSS in the learned Languages are kept in some Libraries, boarded up like the Treasures of Misers, never to be seen or known.

I thought my self in Gratitude and Honour obliged to give this Account of the MSS, which the most pious and virtuous, as well as most learned Man left behind him, because by his last Will and Testament he shewed his great Respect to me, in ordering them to be committed to me, as a Depositum during my Life; and after me to a <sup>t</sup> better hand, to whom my incurable Infirmities will e'er long oblige me with great Satisfaction to transfer them. I was also constrained to do it for my own ease and convenience, to prevent farther trouble from curious and learned Men, from whom I receive frequent Letters of enquiry about his MSS and Remains.

Also before I conclude this Account of my now

---

† The Reverend Dr. Smalridge, Dean of Carlisle,

xxvi *Some Account of Dr. GRABE,*

*bleſſed Friend's MSS, I beg leave to add ſome-  
thing to what I have already ſaid of thoſe Gentlemen  
who are ſo ready to miſrepreſent ſuch Lovers of  
Chriſtian Antiquities as he was, as Favourers of  
Popery, and Introducers of Popiſh Doctrines, or at  
leaſt, as Preparers of the way for them, becauſe  
they wiſh and endeavour, that our Church may  
be conformed to the Cath. Church, of the moſt  
pure and perfect Ages, by reſtoring her to ſome few  
Uſages, which they cannot but wiſh were obſerved  
by her, and all the reformed Churches, to make  
their reſpective Reformations more perfect, accor-  
ding to true Catholick Antiquity, and Univerſa-  
lity, which, to uſe a very much abuſed Phraſe by  
Kirk Writers, is the true Pattern in the Mount. But  
tho' Conformity to this Pattern would be pleaſing to  
God, and very much for the Honour, and better for  
the Peace and Eſtabliſhment of the Church, and the  
Confuſion of her Romiſh Enemies; Yet the Men,  
for whoſe ſakes I am writing theſe Reflections, are  
ſo averſe to this noble Deſign, and every thing  
which tends to it, that they ſtick not to brand us  
on the other ſide with a Mark of *μαλακουργία*, as  
Men that are raving mad for Antiquity, and as  
Diſparagers of the Reformation, and of the Wiſ-  
dom and Learning of our Reformers; and therefore  
I beg leave with all due Reſpect to them, of what  
diſtinction ſoever they are, to ſuggeſt ſome things  
to their mature Conſideration, in order to moderate  
their raſh and unjuſt Cenſures of us. Firſt then I  
pray them to conſider, that as the Church doth  
not think her ſelf infallible; ſo neither doth ſhe  
think her ſelf, or her Reformation perfect, witneſs  
the*



*the Office for the first Day of Lent, called the Commination, wherein she wishes the Godly Discipline of Penance for notorious Sinners might be restored, as it was in the Primitive Church. It is the want of this Discipline, which was in the Primitive Church, that is one of Dr. Grabe's Desiderata above mentioned, and the restoring of which requiring a Penitential Office, not only for reconciling Penitents censur'd for notorious Sins, but of Converts and Profelytes of all sorts; such an Office, hath been justly observed by one of the most severe Censurers of us, who have written in Defence of the Eucharistical Sacrifice, to be wanting in our Church: for which reason he wished it were restored according to the practice of the ancient Churches. These Gentlemen with us also acknowledge the Wants and Imperfections in the Order of the Visitation of the Sick, and the want of an Office for Prisoners, and those condemned to suffer death, to which I may add the want of an Office in behalf of Suffering-Churches in time of Persecution, which I believe they will not disapprove, and for which there will be almost always too much occasion. I pray them also to remember, that they, as well as others, are now sensible of the want of an Office for consecrating or dedicating of Churches; for which the Dissenters may with as much Justice censure them for Introducers of Popery, as they do us for wishing that other Usages of the Primitive Church, more ancient than Consecrations of Churches, might be restored. I must also pray these Gentlemen to consider, whether we are more mad, to use their Expression, for Antiquity, or they for Novelty,*

d. 2



xxviii *Some Account of Dr. GRABE,*

*Novelty, or which of the two Madnesses is most for the Honour of God, and the Benefit and Service of the Church. Let them seriously consider, whether we, who would have the Church come nearer to the Primitive Pattern of Antiquity, or they who would have her go farther from it, are more justly censurable as Madmen, and as Disparagers of the Reformation? Or which of us it is that serve or disserve the Church of Rome most, we, who would if we could, conform our Church to the Plan of Primitive Antiquity (imagine the third Century) which is a Test the Romish Church can neither endure or bear, or they who would deform it in many Particulars after the Novel, most Novel Plat-forms of those Churches and Congregations which despise Antiquity, and therefore I will not name them to prevent Offence. They are the Gentlemen of this averse Spirit to Antiquity, who think Episcopacy not strictly necessary for the Being, but only most convenient for the Well-being of the Church, and who stick not to say, that to give Bishops to any of the Reformed Churches, tho' they had a mind to Bishops, would be to disturb the Peace of all, and make a Schism among them. These Gentlemen also, at least the generality of them, are more tender of the Dissenters, than of their own most faithful Brethren of the Clergy or Laity, whom they little regard how they offend by their Schemes of Comprehension. It is in favour to Dissenters that they will not undertake to determine whether or no our Presbyterian Orders are invalid, and make the Prosecutions in our Courts Christian, a Test of Christianity and Christians, for which not*

to mention other Sects, the Quakers are obliged to them. It is also in favour of them that they now so severely censure us as Innovators, who have written to shew the Invalidity of Lay-Baptism by those, who presume to baptise, not only in the case of extreme Danger by Death, but in ordinary practice, not only without the Allowance and Authority of the Church, but in opposition to her. They are, as I hear, only for discouraging, but not for condemning of it, as we have done. But if Baptism by such Pretenders be valid, why should it be discouraged? Or if it be invalid, as I think we have proved, why should it not be condemned? For there is no magis and minus in the Validity or Invalidity of Sacraments, which cannot be partly valid, and partly invalid. But to shew that this sort of Men have no reason to censure us upon this, or any other Account, as Innovators, and Disparagers of the Reformation, I must here take the liberty to shew, that in the Ecclesiastical Commission shortly after the Revolution, to prepare Matters for Convocation, if the Account I have of it be true, they were for making more Alterations, than I have room here to recite. They were for laying aside the Chaunting of Divine Service in Cathedral Churches; for throwing out all the Apocryphal Lessons; for changing the Old Calendar for a new one, which they had already made; for omitting the Sign of the Cross in Baptism to the scrupulous; for administering the Lord's Supper to those in their Pews, (as was done by a Bishop to some Noncon. Ministers at the time of the Revolution) who refuse to receive it kneeling;

xxx *Some Account of Dr. GRABE,*

*ling ; for permitting Deacons to read the Absolution in Morning and Evening Prayer ; and in order thereunto, that the word Priest alone should be changed into Priest, or Deacon, and that the words in the Rubrick, Absolution, or Remission of Sins, should be put out, as not very intelligible. They were also for ordering that Gloria Patri should not be repeated at the end of every Psalm in the Morning and Evening Service, but only at the end of all ; that the Words in the TE DEUM, thine honourable, true, and only Son, should be changed into thine only begotten Son. The reason assigned for this Alteration, was, because honourable, was only a civil Term, and nowhere used in sacris, which reason, were it true, methinks it might have been as well changed into thine adorable, true, and only Son. About the Creed, commonly call'd the Creed of Athanasius, they came to this Resolution to declare, that the Censures denounced therein, should not be restrained to every particular Article, but only to relate to those, who deny the Substance of the Christian Religion in general. Parents, who desired it, were allowed to present their own Children in Baptism without other Godfathers or Godmothers. In the Prayer for the King, they were for turning the words, Grant that he may vanquish, and overcome all his Enemies, in this manner, Prosper all his righteous Undertaking against thy Enemies. The Collects for the most part were to be changed for others already prepared ; and whether the Amendment of the Translation of the  
Read-*



Reading Psalms, (<sup>u</sup> since most excellently vindicated) made by two of them, or the Bible Translation of the Psalms, should be used in the daily Offices of Morning and Evening Prayer, was wholly left to the Convocation to consider of and determine.

These were some of the Alterations made or designed by this sort of Divines among those Commissioners, of which I have had an Account. But there were others made, or designed to be made, in the Litany, Communion-service, and Canons, which I have not yet seen, but of which I hope to see an Account. I say, by this sort of Divines, among those Commissioners, for there were others that did not like these Proceedings; as Dr. Jane, Dr. Alrich, d Dr. Scot, Dr. Beveridge, afterwards Bishop of St. Asaph, and Dr. Stillingfleet, afterwards Bishop of Worcester, and others, whose Names I do not remember. Dr. Sh., tho' not one of them, wrote against the Commission, and censured those Members of it who were given to change (especially one of them) with so much Freedom and Severity, as I am not willing to relate. And yet these, and others of their unhappy Genius, are the Men who reproach us, because we are for restoring a few Primitive Observances of the best and purest Ages, retained in the first Reformation, as Innovators and Disgracers of the Reformation; not to mention again their raising Suspicions upon us, as Popishly inclined, and having Popish Views, con-

---

\* In a Book entituled *Holy David, &c.* by the Revd. Dr. Johnson.  
trary



*trary to our most Overt Acts. Nay, they cannot but understand, that perfectly to conform the Church of England in all primitive Observances to the Catholick Church, would be as ungrateful to the Roman Pseudo-Catholicks, as it would be to themselves, which makes their Censures of us more inexcusable, and more hurtful to their own Reputation, than ours. For my own part, the good (I might say the Apostolical) Cause of Primitive Antiquity, which I have endeavoured with others to revive, makes me not only not value their Censures, of which I hear very often, but rejoice in them; and I here declare, that as I have made it my study to distinguish betwixt what is truly Primitive, and what is truly Popish in the Church of Rome; so I am for retaining and restoring the former, though I reject and detest the latter, as much as any of them.*

*As for this little Tract of the now blessed Author, upon the first Article of Mr. Whiston's Account of the Faith of the two first Centuries, it was written, as I have been told since his Death, at the request of his Grace the Archbishop of York, who had an esteem for him adequate to his great Merits. And it was <sup>x</sup> apparently finished, before his Essay against Mr. Whiston upon the two Arabick MSS, and that ancient Book called the Doctrine of the Apostles, said to be extant in them. The reason why he did not publish it with that Discourse, was very probably because he intended to write more Observations*

---

<sup>x</sup> See p. 10.

*upon that Account of the Faith of the two first Centuries, as he seems to intimate in the second Page of this short Treatise, where he declares that he had observed many things in it defective, more superfluous, little or nothing to the purpose, and most of the Collections therein wrong, or misapplied, but the Circumstances he was in, when he wrote, would by no means permit him to set down all his Observations. I have observed this, to encourage learned Men to make their Observations after this great Man's Example, upon all the other Articles, towards finishing this good Work, which he so happily began. It is to be hoped, that the famous and learned University of Cambridge, to whom Mr. Wh. hath dedicated his Account, will furnish out such a Person, as will thoroughly discuss it to his Confusion, as Mr. Thirlby hath done his 17 Suspicions of St. Athanasius, to whom, I believe, such scandalous Names were never given by any English Priest before, but by that Monster of Impudence, and Scandal of the Christian Priesthood and Religion, Titus Oates of Infamous Memory, who by Contagion from others, was taught to call him Sathanasius, and other reproachful Names. But Mr. Whiston is a Person of unblemish'd Morals, of Learning, and used to the best Conversation; and it is matter of wonder to me, that he could bring himself to treat a Father so unjustly and rudely, that for 1300 Years had been in Possession of so much Reputation for Sanctity and Learning. Methinks the very Collections of Testimonies of him and his Writings before his*

e

Works,

xxxiv *Some Account of Dr. GRABE,*

*Works, without other Authorities, might have made him more modest and sparing in his Censures; but if he thinks so soberly of himself, as he pretends to do, he hath something within him which overcomes his Temper, when he writes against the Deity of his Saviour, and the Holy Ghost. It is that which made him rave against that H. Father, ridicule the Word Orthodox, advance without any proof so many bold precarious Assertions in his late Writings, and above all, presume in a most unparallel'd manner, to impose upon the Christian World, after 1700 Years, y a new sacred Book of the N. Testament, of which, as Dr. Grabe observes, he understood not one word, nor had so much as heard read in English to him: An Instance of Boldness, scarce, if at all, to be met with in any Controversial Writer, and which would have better become an Unbeliever of revealed Religion, than Mr. Whiston. But to return to my Parænesis, being not able to undertake such a laborious Work my self, I only had the Curiosity to see how Mr. Whiston had apply'd one Passage in Justin Martyr's first (commonly called his second) Apology, which I always look'd upon as a very full and plain Testimony of the Church, for the Divinity of our Saviour. I say of the Church, because whatever he wrote in his Apologies, of the Practice and Doctrine of Christians, he wrote not in his own Name, but as all the Apologists did, in the Name, and as the Doctrine and Practice of the whole Sect. I will here set down the Passage*

---

<sup>y</sup> The Arabick Didascalia.



more at large as in Justin, and then translate it, and make my Observations upon it, and Mr. W's way of citing it, and shew that he hath not cited it in its proper Simplicity, as he speaks in his Preface, but in a partial and imperfect manner, by giving us \* one Line of it for the whole, contrary to the Impartiality, and Veracity, to which he pretends in all his Writings with a most serious Christian Air.

Οἱ τινες ἔχοντες ῥητῶς εἰρημῶν ἐν τοῖς Μωσείως σωτάμοσι· καὶ ἐλάλησεν ἄγγελος· ὅτι δεῦ τῷ Μωσεῖ ἐν πυρὶ φλογὸς ἐν βάτω, καὶ εἶπεν, ἐγὼ εἰμι ὁ ὢν, ὁ θεὸς Ἀβραάμ, καὶ ὁ θεὸς Ἰσαάκ, καὶ ὁ θεὸς Ἰακώβ, ὅτι ὅλων πατέρα καὶ δημιουργὸν ὅτι ταῦτα εἰπόντα λέγουσιν· ὅτι· ὁ δὲν καὶ τὸ προφητικὸν πνεῦμα ἐλέγχον αὐτοῖς εἶπεν, Ἰσραὴλ δὲ με ἔκ ἐγνω, καὶ ὁ λαὸς με ἐσυνῆκε· Καὶ πάλιν ὁ Ἰησοῦς, ὡς ἐδηλώσαμεν, παρ' αὐτοῖς ὢν, εἶπεν, ὅδε εἰς ἐγὼν ὅτι πατέρα, εἰ μὴ ὁ υἱός· ὅδε ὅτι υἱὸν εἰ μὴ ὁ πατήρ, καὶ οἷς ἂν ὁ υἱὸς ἀπεκαλύψῃ. Ἰουδαῖοι ἐν ἡγησάμενοι αἰετὸν τὸν πατέρα ὅτι ὅλων λελαληκέναι τῷ Μωσεῖ, τῷ λαλήσαντι αὐτῷ ὅτι· ὅτι δεῦ, ὅς καὶ ἄγγελος καὶ ἀπόστολος κέκληται, δικαίως ἐλέγχεται καὶ διὰ τῷ προφητικῷ πνεύματι, καὶ δι' αὐτῷ τῷ Χριστῷ, ὡς ἔπε τὸν πατέρα ἔπε τὸν υἱὸν ἐγνωσαν. Οἱ γὰρ τὸν υἱὸν πατέρα φαύσκοιτες· ὅτι, ἐλέγχεται μήτε τὸν πατέρα ὁπιστάμενοι, μήθ' ὅτι ἔστιν υἱὸς τῷ πατρί ὅτι ὅλων γνωσκόντες· ὅς καὶ λόγος πρωτότοκος ὢν τῷ θεῷ, καὶ θεὸς ὑπάρχει. Καὶ πρότερον διὰ τῆς τῷ πνεύματος μαρτυρίας καὶ εἰπόντος· ἀπομάρτυρε τῷ Μωσεῖ καὶ τοῖς ἑτέροις προφήταις ἐφάνη· νῦν δὲ ἐν χρόνοις τῆς ὑμετέρας ἀρχῆς, ὡς προείπομεν, διὰ παρθένου ἀνθρώπου· ἡμῶν, καὶ ὅτι τῷ πατρὶ βελλῶ, ὑπὲρ σωτηρίας ὅτι πνευμάτων αὐτῶν, καὶ ὅτι ἐγεννηθῆναι καὶ παθεῖν ὑπέμεινεν, ἵνα ἀποθανῶν καὶ

\* Account of the Prim. Faith, p. 93.



ἀναστὰς νικήσῃ τὸν θάνατον. Τὸ δ' εἰρημῶν ἐκ βάτῃ  
 τῷ Μωσῇ, ἐγὼ εἰμι ὁ ὢν, ὁ Θεὸς Ἀβραάμ, καὶ ὁ Θεὸς  
 Ἰσαὰκ, καὶ ὁ Θεὸς Ἰακώβ, καὶ ὁ Θεὸς τῶν πατέρων σου,  
 σημερινὸν τὸ καὶ ἀποθανόντας ἐκείνους μῦθον, καὶ εἶ  
 αὐτὸ τῷ Χριστῷ ἀνθρώπῳ. Καὶ ὁ πρῶτος τῶν πάν-  
 των ἀνθρώπων ἐκείνοι πρὸ Θεοῦ ζήτησιν ἠκολούθησαν,  
 Ἀβραάμ μὲν πατὴρ ὢν τῷ Ἰσαὰκ, Ἰσαὰκ δὲ τῷ  
 Ἰακώβ, ὡς καὶ Μωσὴς ἀνέγραψε. Edit. Paris. 1615.  
 p. 96. Oxon. 1700. §. 83. p. 123, 124. Who  
 [the Jews that had crucified our Saviour] ha-  
 ving it expressly declared in the Writings of  
 Moses, that the Angel of God spake to Moses  
 in the flame of Fire in the Bush, and said, *I am*  
*the I A M, the God of Abraham, and the God*  
*of Isaac, and the God of Jacob,* affirm him that  
 said this to be the Father and Maker of all  
 Things. For which reason, the Spirit by the  
 Prophet reproved them, saying, *Israel hath not*  
*known me, and the People hath not understood me.*  
 And again, *Jesus,* as we have already observed,  
 whilst he was among them, said, *No Man know-*  
*eth the Father but the Son, nor the Son but the*  
*Father, and he to whomsoever the Son will reveal*  
*him.* Wherefore the Jews concluding it was  
 always the Father of all things who spake to  
 Moses, whereas he that spake to him was the  
 Son of God, who is called also the Angel and  
 Messenger, are deservedly reprehended, both  
 by the Prophetick Spirit, and by Christ himself,  
 for not knowing either the Father, or the Son.  
 For they that say the Son is the Father, are to  
 be blamed for not knowing the Father, nor un-

Exod. 3. 14. 'Εγὼ εἰμι. S. Jo. 8. 58.

derstanding that the Father of all things has a Son. Who being the first begotten Word of God, is also God. And heretofore he appeared to *Moses* and the Prophets in the form of Fire, and an incorporeal Likeness; but now under your Government, being, as was said before, Man made of a Virgin, according to the Decree of the Father, he condescended to be set at nought, and to suffer, for the Salvation of them that believe him, that dying and rising again he might overcome Death. Now what was said to *Moses* out of the Bush, *I am the I AM, the God of Abraham, and the God of Isaac, and the God of Jacob, and the God of thy Fathers,* denotes that they, though dead, are still in being, and are Christ's Men. For they were the first of all Men that applyed themselves to enquire after God, *Abraham* being the Father of *Isaac*, and *Isaac* of *Jacob*, as *Moses* has left it upon Record. In this Passage Christ is twice asserted to be the same 'O ΩΝ, or I AM, that was the God of the Jews, the God, of whose Essence it was to exist, and therefore called himself I AM, and I AM that I AM, and also JEHOVAH from the same Verb HAI AH, which in Hebrew signifies to be, or exist. The same God who appeared to Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob, and of whose Appearance the Scripture speaking, saith, that Jehovah <sup>a</sup> spake unto them; Jehovah who said unto Abraham, <sup>b</sup> I am Elshaddai the Almighty God,

<sup>a</sup> Gen. xii. i. 4. 7. and to have plagued Pharaoh, xv. i. 18.

<sup>b</sup> Gen. xvii. i. Exod. vi. 3.

xxxviii *Some Account of Dr. GRABE,*

*and to whom* <sup>c</sup> *Abraham said, Adonai Jehovah, Lord God, and to whom* <sup>d</sup> *he built an Altar, and would have offered his only Son, and made his Steward swear by his Name Jehovah Elohe, the Lord God. And as Justin saith, that the first begotten Word of God appeared to Moses in the form of Fire, Exod. iii. 2. So in the 4th and 7th Ver. of that Chapter, he is called Jehovah, and in the 17th ver. Jehovah Elohe, the Lord God of your Fathers, and in the vi<sup>th</sup> Chap. v. 1. he is called Jehovah again, and in the third vers. this first begotten Word saith: I appeared to Abraham, &c. by the Name of God* <sup>e</sup> *Almighty, but by or in my* <sup>f</sup> *Name JEHOVAH, that is, [as all learned Men interpret the place] by or in the Power of my Name JEHOVAH, in which I work Miracles, I was not known to them. Hence throughout the whole Negotiation between Moses and Pharaoh, God is called Jehovah, as he said unto Moses, Exod. vii. 5. The Egyptians shall know that I am Jehovah, when I stretch forth mine Hand. Accordingly the same God, who delivered them out of Egypt, calls himself Jehovah Elohecha, I am Jehovah thy God, Exod. xx. 1.*

<sup>c</sup> Gen. xv. 2.

<sup>d</sup> Gen. xii. 7. xiii. 4.

<sup>e</sup> Or All-sufficient.

<sup>f</sup> *Jehovah*, was the ineffable Name of God among the Jews, and ever believed by them to be incommunicable to any but the Supreme God, who was their God: Mr. Whiston, against the Opinion of learned Men versed in Jewish Learning and Antiquities, to avoid the force of Christ's being called by the ineffable incommunicable Name of *Jehovah*, denies it to be incommunicable, but it hath been proved against him to be so very clearly by his learned Adversary in his Reply, entituled, *A second Letter to the Author of the History of Montanism.*

*Thus*



Thus according to Justin their Apologist, it was the common Doctrine of the Christians, that as the first begotten Word of God, or his Son, who was the First-born of all Creatures, was the Angel that appeared to Moses in the flaming Bush: So that Angel was that Jehovah, who spake to Abraham, and to whom Abraham offered the supreme Worship of Sacrifice, as also the  $\text{'O } \Omega \text{N}$ , the eternal I AM, & the Lord God of the Hebrews, who delivered them out of Egypt, whom they tempted in the Desert, and whom they worshipped in the Tabernacle, and in the Temple; tho' as Justin observes, they did not know or understand him to be God, <sup>h</sup> as the Son of God, who is also called Angel, and Messenger, and were therefore deservedly reprehended by the Prophetick Spirit, and by Christ himself, for not knowing either the Father, or the Son: And then he adds with respect to some Christian Hereticks, for they that say the Son is the Father, are to be blamed for not knowing the Father, nor understanding that the Father of all things hath a Son, who being the first begotten Word of God, is also God. And heretofore he appeared to Moses, &c. Wherefore Mr. Whiston shou'd methinks under this Article,

---

<sup>g</sup> 1 Kings viii. Solomon at the Dedication calls him the Lord, and the Lord God of Israel, who made a Covenant with the Children of Israel, the Lord who spake unto his Father David, the God of Israel, the Lord our God, the Lord who is God, and there is none else, whom he blessed, to whom he prayed, to whom he dedicated the Temple and the Altar, and to whom with all Israel he offered Sacrifices of all sorts. In *Psalm* lxxviii, which is a recital of all the Miracles that were wrought for the Jews, to the time of his Father David, he is celebrated as the Almighty Worker of them.

<sup>h</sup> Dial. cum Tryph. p. 354.



xl *Some Account of Dr. GRABE,*

*have set down the whole Passage, and not mangled and disjointed it, that the Christian Doctrine reported by Justin, might appear in its full Light and Force, viz. That he was the God of Abraham, &c. and that the dead Patriarchs were still in being, and were the Men of the same God our Saviour Jesus Christ. To this Passage he might also have added under this Article, of his Account of the Primitive Faith, others of the same Nature, in his Dialogue with Trypho; such as these which follow.* "Οπ δὲ καὶ Θεὸν τὸ Χριστὸν καλεῖ, ἐν πολλοῖς ἀποδείκνυται. That Christ is called God, is shewn in many Instances, p. 354. And again, Διὰ τῶ μυστηρίου τοῦ πάλης ἣν ἐπάλασεν Ἰακώβ μὲν τὸ φανερῶν μὲν, ἐκ τῶ τῇ τῷ πατρὶ βουλῇ ἐπαρῆν. Θεὸς δὲ, ἐκ τῶ ἐν τέκνον πρωτότοκον τῶν ὅλων κτισμάτων, ἐπεπεροφῆτόντο, ὅτως καὶ ἀνθρώπου. ἡμῶν οὖν ὁ Χριστὸς ποιήσειν, ibid.—

By the Mystery of *Jacob's* wrestling with him that appeared to him, pursuant to the Decree of the Father; but who was God, being the Son who was first born of all the Creatures, as was prophesied concerning Christ made Man.

And again, Τίς δ' ἐστὶν ὁ Θεὸς καὶ ἄγγελος μεγάλης βουλῆς ποτε, καὶ ἀνὴρ διὰ Ἰεζεκιήλ, — Καὶ Χριστὸς, καὶ Θεὸς περὶ σκωπητὸς διὰ Δαβὶδ — καὶ ῥάβδος καὶ ἀνὴρ, καὶ λίθος ἀκρογωνιαίος κέκληται, καὶ υἱὸς Θεοῦ, εἰ ἐγνώκειτε, ὡς Τρύφων, ἐφίλω, ὅτι ἂν ἐβλάσφημαίτε εἰς αὐτὸν, p. 355. I have told you, O *Trypho*, that had ye known who this is, who is sometimes called the Angel of the great Counsel of God and Man by *Ezekiel*, and Christ, and God to be worshipped by *David*,

and

and a Rod, and a Flower, and a chief Cornerstone, and the Son of God, ye would not have blasphemed him. *And a little after in the same Page;* 'Εἰ νενοήκατε τὰ εἰρημύα ὑπὸ τῶ προφητῶ ἐκ ἂν ἐξηρνεῖσθε αὐτὸν εἰς Θεόν, τὸ μόνον καὶ ἀγενήτως καὶ ἀρρήτως Θεὸς ὢν! 'Εἰρηλαί γάρ πε καὶ διὰ Μωϋσέως ὅν τῇ 'Εξόδῳ ἕκτας· ἐλάλησε ὃ κύριος πρὸς Μωσὴν, καὶ εἶπε πρὸς αὐτὸν· ἐγὼ εἰμι Κύριος καὶ ὥφθην πρὸς τὸν 'Αβραάμ, καὶ 'Ισαὰκ, καὶ 'Ιακώβ, Θεὸς αὐτῶν, καὶ τὸ ὄνομα μὲ ἐκ ἐδήλωσα αὐτοῖς, καὶ ἔστησα τὸ Ἀσθὲν καὶ πρὸς αὐτοὺς. Καὶ ἔτι πάλιν λέγει μὲν 'Ιακώβ ἄνθρωπος ἐπάλασε καὶ Διόν φησιν εἰς· εἶδον γὰρ Θεὸν πρόσωπον πρὸς πρόσωπον, καὶ ἐσώθη ἡ ψυχή μου, λέγει εἰρηκέναι τὸν 'Ιακώβ· καὶ ὅτι τὸ πῦρ ὅπερ αὐτὸν ἐπάλασε καὶ ὥφθη, καὶ ἠυλόγησε, καὶ ἐκάλεσεν, εἶδεν Θεὸς ἀνέγεραι. Καὶ τῷ 'Αβραάμ ὁμοίως Μωσῆς φησιν, ὥφθη ὁ Θεὸς πρὸς τῇ δρυὶ τῇ Μαμβρῇ, καὶ διημύω ἐπὶ τῇ δύρας τῇ σκηνῇ αὐτῇ μεσεμβρίας, &c. Had ye understood the Sayings of the Prophets, ye would not have denied the Son of the only, and unbegotten, and ineffable God, to be God. For thus it is spoken by Moses in Exodus: *The Lord spake to Moses, and said unto him, I am the Lord, and have been seen of Abraham, and Isaac, and Jacob, their God, and my Name I have not made known to them, and I have established my Covenant with them. And so he says again, A Man wrestled with Jacob, and he says he is God: For he testifies Jacob to have said, I have seen God face to face, and my Life was preserved. And he stiled the place where he wrestled, and was seen, and blessed, and called,*

xlü Some Account of Dr. GRABE,

led, & *The Face of God*. To *Abraham* likewise *Moses* saith, God appeared at the Oak *Mambre*, as he sat at Noon-time, in the Door of his Tent. He is said to have seen three Men standing before him. Μετ' ὀλίγον ὃ εἰς εἰς αὐτῶν ὑπαγα-  
γεται τῷ Ἀβραάμ υἱόν. Τί ὅτι ἐγγέλασε Σάρρα, λέ-  
γουσα, ἄρα γὰρ πέθομαι· ἐγὼ δὲ γηγερεα, μὴ ἀδυ-  
νατεῖ ὧδ' αὖ τῷ Θεῷ ῥῆμα· εἰς τὸ καιρὸν τῶτον ἀπο-  
στείλω εἰς ὧρας, καὶ ἔσται τῇ Σάρρᾳ υἱός, p. 356. Pre-  
sently after one of them promises *Abraham* a Son; asking of him, Why did *Sarah* laugh, say-  
ing, shall I yet have a Child, now that I am  
grown old? Is any thing too hard for God? At the appointed time I will return, and *Sarah*  
shall have a Son. And again, one of these three  
resolves with himself, in relation to the destru-  
ction of *Sodom*, namely ὅς ἐστιν καὶ ἐστίν, he that was  
and is, resolves I say with himself, καὶ μὴ κρύψω  
ἀπὸ τοῦ παιδὸς μου Ἀβραάμ ἐγὼ ἃ μέλλω ποιεῖν, I  
will not hide from my servant *Abraham*, what  
things I am about to do. Δι' ὧν ἀπεδείκται ὑπὸ  
τῷ πατρὶ καὶ τῷ Κυρίῳ πεπαγμένῳ, καὶ ὑποηρετῶν  
τῇ βουλῇ αὐτοῦ, ὅτι ὡς ὡφθη τῷ τε Ἀβραάμ, καὶ τῷ  
Ἰσαάκ, καὶ τῷ Ἰακώβ, καὶ τοῖς ἄλλοις πατριάρχαϊς,  
ἀναγγελαμένῳ Θεός. Whereby he appears to  
be appointed by the Father and Lord, and to  
serve his Counsel, who appeared to *Abraham*  
and *Isaac*, and *Jacob*, and the other Patriarchs,  
and is declared in the Scriptures to be God. So  
also when the People desired Meat for their Lusts,



Moses distrusted the Angel that spake to him, and promised that God would give them it to the full, αὐτὸς ὢν καὶ Θεός, καὶ ἄγγελος παρὰ τῷ πατρὶος πεπεμμένον, ταῦτα εἶπεν καὶ πειράσαι ἠελύτα. Οὕτως γὰρ ἐπάγει ἡ γραφὴ λέγουσα, καὶ εἶπε Κύριος πρὸς Μωϋσῆν, μὴ ἡ χεὶρ Κυρίου ἔκ ὕψους ἀρχήσῃ; ἥδη γνώσῃ εἰ ὁπικαλύψεται σε ὁ λόγος μου, ἢ ἔτι καὶ πάλιν ἐν ἄλλοις λόγοις ἔτι φησὶ, Κύριος ὃ εἶπε πρὸς με, ἔτι ἀλαλήσῃ τὸ Ἰσραὴλ τὸν Κύριον. ὁ Θεός σε ποροποιήσας τὸ πρὸς σέ, αὐτὸς ἐξολοθρεύσει τὰ ἔθνη· καὶ τὰ ἄλλα καὶ τοιαῦτα ἔστιν ἐξημῶν τῷ νομοθέτῃ καὶ τοῖς ποροφῆταις. Καὶ ἰκανῶς εἰρηδασάμενος ὑπολαμβάνω, ὅτι ὅταν με ὁ Θεός λέγῃ, ἀνέβη ὁ Θεός ἀπὸ Ἀβραάμ· ἢ ἐλάλησε κύριος πρὸς Μωσῆν· καὶ κατέβη κύριος τὸ πύργον ἰδεῖν, ὃν ὠκοδόμησαν οἱ υἱοὶ τοῦ ἀνθρώπου· καὶ ὅτε ἐκλείσεν ὁ Θεός τὸ κιβωτὸν Νῶε ἐξωδεν, μὴ ἡγεῖσθε αὐτὸν τὸν ἀγνῶστον Θεὸν καταβεβηκέναι, ἢ ἀναβεβηκέναι ποθεν.--- Οὐτε ἔνι Ἀβραάμ, ἔτι Ἰσαὰκ, ἔτι Ἰακώβ, ἔτι ἄλλου ἀνθρώπου εἶδε τὸν πατέρα καὶ ἄρρητον Κύριον τὸ πάντων ἢ ἀπλῶς, καὶ αὐτὸς τὸ Χριστός· ἀλλ' ἐκείνον τὸν καὶ βελλὺν τὸ ἐκείνους καὶ Θεὸν ὄντα ὑπὸ αὐτῷ, καὶ ἄγγελον ἐκ τῷ ὑπερεῖν τῇ γνώμῃ αὐτοῦ· ὃν καὶ ἀνθρώπου γνησθῆναι διὰ τὸ παρθένα γενέσθαι· ὅς καὶ πῦρ ποτε γέγονε τῇ πρὸς Μωσέα ὁμιλίᾳ τῇ ἀπὸ τοῦ βάτου, &c. p.356. Tho' he that promised was apparently both God, and the Angel sent from the Father, to declare and do these things. For so the Scripture proceeds, saying, And the Lord said unto Moses, cannot the hand of the Lord make it good? Thou

<sup>h</sup> Simpliciter.

xliv *Some Account of Dr. GRABE,*

*shalt quickly find whether my Word shall cover thee, or not. And again upon another occasion he speaks thus, <sup>i</sup> The Lord said unto me, thou shalt not go over this Jordan: the <sup>k</sup> Lord thy God goeth before thy face; he shall destroy the Nations. Many other like sayings are also spoken to the Law-giver, and to the Prophets. And I think I have made it plain enough, that when my God saith, God ascended from Abraham: or the Lord spake to Moses: And the Lord came down to see the Tower, which the Sons of Men had built: or when God from without shut up Noe in the Ark; you are not to imagine the unbegotten God himself to have ascended, or descended from any place.—Wherefore neither Abraham, nor Isaac, nor Jacob, nor any other Man hath seen the Father, who is simply the ineffable Lord of <sup>l</sup> all things, <sup>m</sup> and of Christ himself; but him who according to his Counsel,*  
is

---

<sup>i</sup> Hebr. *Jehovah*.

<sup>k</sup> Hebr. *Jehovah Elohecha*.

<sup>l</sup> Or of the Universe.

<sup>m</sup> *Justin* in his *Dialogue with Trypho*, p. 358, explains in what sense God the Father, the ineffable Lord of the Universe, is also the Lord of Christ himself, viz. as his Father, and the Author or Principle from whom he derived his Essence and Divinity. For after he had shewn from *Gen. xix. 24.* that there were two Lords or *Jehovahs* [*Δύο ὄντας Ἰερωμῶ*] numerically, that is in his sense personally distinct, one upon Earth, which, saith he, the Prophetic Word [of *Moses*] saith came down from Heaven to see the Cry of *Sodom*, and another, who was in Heaven; then he adds, *Ὁς καὶ ἔστι γῆς Κυεὶς Κυεῖός ἐστιν, ὡς Πατὴρ καὶ Θεός, αὐτὸς τε αὐτῷ ἔστι, καὶ δυνάτω, καὶ Κυεῖω, καὶ Θεῶ, who also is the Lord of the Lord that was upon Earth, as his Father and God, and the Cause or Author unto him of his Essence, and Power, and of his being Lord,*

is God his Son, and Angel, because he serves his Will; whom he would have to be born Man of a Virgin, who heretofore was a Fire, in his Conversation with *Moses* from the Bush, &c.

*Mr. Whiston might also have taken notice of the Reason Justin gives in p. 258. for his elaborate, and as he in Modesty censures it, his super-abundant recital of the many Appearances of the ΛΟΓΟΣ, which (he saith) was for the sake of those, who said that it was the Power, or Virtue, of the Father of the Universe, which appeared to Moses, &c. and that it was called ΛΟΓΟΣ, because it brought the Messages of the Father to Men. And that the Father when he pleased, could make this Virtue gush out of himself, and draw it back up to himself again. And that in this manner he made the Angels. But saith Justin, I have demonstrated already, that Angels are perma-*

---

*Lord, and God.* It was then only upon the account of his *Personal Dignity*, or *Relative Superiority*, as the Fountain of Divinity, or Ὁ ΑΥΤΟΘΕΟΣ, who was God of, and from himself; that the Father is said by *Justin*, to be Lord of Christ his Son, who derived his Essence or Existence, and Divinity from him; and as his Son, was God, and the God of the *Jews*, and of their Fathers, *Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob*, to whom the Title of Δευσιδης in the aforesaid Passage is peculiarly ascribed in the Old and New Testament, as *Mr. Whiston* may find in the Septuagint, *Pf. lxxxix. 8. Pf. xxiv. 8. Pf. xlv. 3. Pf. cvi. 8. Jerem. xxxii. 19. Luke i. 4.* as well as Κύριος and Θεός. And therefore it was not for any Inequality in Nature or Essence, but upon the account of the *personal and relative Inequality* in the Order and Oeconomy of the Holy Trinity, that *Justin* asserted the Father to be the Lord of Christ his Son, whom he took so much pains in proving to the *Jews*, that he was their God, the Worship of *Israel*; and whom in his Dialogue with *Trypho*, p. 359. he saith, the Prophet foretold, that the *Gentiles* should rejoice to worship with them.



ment Beings, and do not return by Dissolution into that of which they are made: *And* I have in like manner demonstrated at large, that that power, which the word of the Prophet calls God, and Angel, is *not as the Light is reckoned distinct from the Sun, only in Name<sup>n</sup>*, but is another thing [or subsistent] numerically distinct [from the Father] as I have elaborately proved; where I said, ° That this Power is begotten by the Father, by his Power and Will, but <sup>p</sup> not by *Abscission*, as if the Substance of the Father was divided, as all other things are not the same by Partition, and Abscission, that they were before they were divided, and cut off. *And then that this begotten Power, which was never separate from him, was numerically distinct from him, he illustrates by a Comparison which he had used before, of 1 kindling other Fires from one, without any diminution of that one Fire from which the others are kindled; and to shew farther that the Begotten Power of the Father, of which, in p. 284. he saith, αὐτὸς ὢν ὁ Θεὸς ἀπὸ τοῦ Πατρὸς τῶν ὅλων γνηθεῖς, I say, to prove*

<sup>n</sup> Ἀλλὰ καὶ αἰθερῶν ἑτερόν τι ὄντι.

° Εἰπὼν τὸ δυνάμιν πᾶσι γενηθεῖς ἀπὸ τοῦ πατρὸς, p. 358. So p. 332. Μονοθεῖς γὰρ ὅτι ὡς τὸ πᾶσι τῶν ὅλων ὄντι, ἰδίως καὶ αὐτὸς λόγος, καὶ Δυνάμεις γενηθεῖς, &c. παρεδήλωσα, viz. in p. 284. A. B. C.

<sup>p</sup> Εἰπὼν τὸ δυνάμιν πᾶσι γενηθεῖς ἀπὸ τοῦ πατρὸς, δυνάμει καὶ βελῇ αὐτὸς ἀλλ' ἔτι καὶ Ἀποσιμῶν, ὡς ἀπομειζουμένης τὸ τοῦ πατρὸς ἐσίας, κ. τ. λ. So p. 284. Λόγον γὰρ τίνα παρὰ τὸν λόγον, λόγον γνηθεῖς καὶ καὶ Ἀποσιμῶν, ὡς ἐλαττωθεῖς τὸ ἐν ἡμῖν λόγον.

<sup>a</sup> Παρεδήλωσα τὸ χάριν παρὰ τὸν λόγον τὰ ὡς ἀπὸ πνεύματος ἀναπτόμενα πνεύμα ἑτέρα, κ. τ. λ.

farther,

farther, that the begotten Power of the Father was numerically distinct from him, though not divided from him; he repeats that Passage again, Gen. xix. 24. Jehovah rained Fire from Jehovah out of Heaven; where, saith he, the Prophet shews that <sup>r</sup> there are two in number, one on Earth, and the other in Heaven, who was the Lord of the Lord that was on Earth as his Father, and God, &c. as before cited. Then he produces another Argument from those Words, Gen. iii. 22. And the Lord God said, Behold the Man is become as one of us, which saith he, <sup>r</sup> denote Number, or a numerical Distinction. Lastly, to prove this Numerical Distinction, by which, as Mr. IBBETSON in his excellent Sermon observes, he meant no more than we do by a Personal Distinction. Then he cites the words, Prov. viii. 22, 23, &c. as in the LXX, which he had produced before more at large, p. 284. after this Introduction, μαρτύρησει δὲ μοι ὁ λόγος τῆς Σοφίας, αὐτὸς ὢν ὁ Θεὸς ἀπὸ τοῦ Πατρὸς τῶν ὅλων γεννηθεὶς, καὶ λόγος καὶ Σοφία, καὶ δυνάμις, καὶ δόξα τοῦ γενήσαντος ὑπάρχων, καὶ διὰ Σολομῶντος φήσαντος ταῦτα: And having recited the Words, then saith he, Νοεῖτε ὦ Ἀκροαταί, εἶπε καὶ τὸν νῦν προσέχει, καὶ ὅτι γεννηθεὶς ὑπὸ τοῦ πατρὸς τὸ τοῦτο τὸ γεννημα πρὸ πάντων ἀπλῶς τῶν κτισμάτων ὁ λόγος ἐδήλω.

<sup>r</sup> Δύω ὄντας Ἀειθμῶ μισθῶει ὁ λόγος ὁ πνευματικός.

<sup>r</sup> Καὶ αὐτὸ Ἀειθμῶ δηλοτικόν ὄν.

<sup>r</sup> So Apol. II, (1.) p. 66. Τῷ ᾧ καὶ τὸ λόγον, ὁ ἔστι πρῶτον γένημα τῷ Θεῷ ἀνὰ ἐπιμιξίας φάσκειν ἡμᾶς γεννηθῆναι Ἰησοῦν Χριστὸν διδάσκαλον ἡμῶν.

xlviij Some Account of Dr. GRABE,

καὶ τὸ ἁνθρώπου τὸ ἁγίου ἀριθμῶ ἐπεὶ ἔστι.  
Understand, O you that hear! if your Minds  
are intent, that the Word doth declare, that  
this which was begotten, was begotten by the  
Father before all Creatures whatsoever, and al-  
so, that what was begotten, was another in  
number from him [*the Father*] who begot him.  
*The Summary then of the Christian Doctrine con-  
cerning Christ, according to Justin, is this; that  
he was the begotten Word or Son of God the Fa-  
ther, <sup>v</sup> and as being his begotten Word, or Son,  
was also God; that he was begotten of him be-  
fore all Creatures whatsoever, without Diminution,  
Partition, or Division, and therefore was of  
the same undivided Substance with him; but  
though he was of the same undivided Substance,  
yet he was ἐπεὶ ἀριθμῶ, another Person, or  
personally distinct from him: So that though  
the Lord who rained Fire upon Sodom, and the  
Lord from whom he rained the Fire, were δύο  
ἀριθμῶ, i.e. two Persons, yet they were but of  
one undivided Substance: The Lord in Heaven  
was Lord, and the Lord on Earth was Lord, and  
yet in Essence or Substance they were not two  
Lords, but one Lord. The Father, or Γεννῶν, was  
not the Son, nor the Γεννώμενος, or Son the Fa-  
ther, as the Sabellians affirmed; nor on the other  
Extreme are they divided, parted, or cut asun-  
der, as the opposite Heresy did teach. Lastly,*

---

<sup>v</sup> Ταῦτον γὰρ ἡγήσαντο λέγειν ἐκ τοῦ Θεοῦ, ὃ τὸ λέγειν ἐκ τοῦ  
εἰσίας τοῦ Θεοῦ ἐστὶν τὸν λόγον. Athan. Synod. Nicen.

that



that it was Christ the begotten Word, Power, or Son of God, who manifested himself in so many different Appearances, and was the God of the Jews, and of their Fathers; the God to whom, as hath been shewed, they paid supreme Adoration, and who is set forth in the Scriptures by all the Titles and Attributes of the supreme God; and of whom it is said, Deut. vi. 4. Hear O Israel, the Lord our God is one Lord. This is the Doctrine of the ancient Christians according to Justin, which he delivered in his Apologies and Dialogue, as the Doctrine of the Church; and had it not been the very Doctrine of the Church, but a strange and corrupt Doctrine, taken from the School of Plato, as our modern Arians and Socinians precariously affirm; we may be sure, as the learned BALTUS in the Preface of his <sup>u</sup> excellent Book observes, that the Holy Fathers and Bishops of the Church, would have treated him with the same Rigour, as they did Cerinthus, Marcion, Basilides, Valentinus, Paulus Samosatenus, and other Heresiarchs, and would no more have spared him, notwithstanding his Learning, Sanctity and Martyrdom, than they did his Disciple Tatian, had he altered, or corrupted the Christian Faith; and therefore the Doctrines which he delivered concerning Christ, must have been the Doctrines of his Age, the very Doctrines which the Church had received from the Apostles. This Doctrine, as I observed before, is the very truth between the two extreme

---

\* Defense des SS. Peres accusez de Platonisme.

# lix Some Account of Dr. GRABE,

*Heresies, that of the Autotheists or \* Monarchians, who taught that the Father was the Son, and the Son the Father, which made them one Person, and that of those, who writing, as Dionysius Romanus expresses it, in diametrical Opposition against Sabellius that famous Monarchian\* did in a manner make three Gods, by dividing the Unity into three alien Hypostases separated from one another.*

*I have set down his words in the Margin, because Mr. Whiston with great Assurance would make his Readers believe in his Letter to Mr. Thirleby, that they are not the Stile and Language of the Age in which Dionysius lived, that is of the third Century, about the Year 259. But why should not τριάς, and μόνας be the Language of that Age in the Latin Church, which was the Language of Tertullian, a famous Latin Father about forty Years before. Advers. Praxeam. c. 3. Numerum & dispositionem Tri-*

\* Tertul. advers. Prax. c. 10.

\* Athanas. Synod. Nicen. decret. contra Hæres. Arian. Edit. Paris. 1627. Ἰδὲ καὶ ὁ τῷ Ῥώμῃ ἐπίσκοπος Διονύσιος γεγραπὸν ἔχει τὰ τῷ Σαβελλίῳ φρονούντων, ἀνελκίσας καὶ τὰ ταῦτα πολλῶν λέγειν· καὶ φησιν ὅτως ἔχει· δὲ ἂν εἰκότως λέγοιμι καὶ πρὸς διαρρήσας, καὶ κατατέμνουσας, καὶ ἀναρρήσας τὸ Σεμνότατον κήρυγμα τῇ Ἐκκλησίᾳ τῷ Θεῷ· τῇ μοναρχίᾳ---εἰς τρεῖς διωόμεναι τινὰς καὶ μεμεισμένης ὑποστάσεις· καὶ θεότητας τρεῖς· πέπυσμαι γὰρ εἶναι τινὰς τῷ παρ' ὑμῖν καθηγμένῳ καὶ διδασκόντων τῷ θεῷ λόγον ταύτης ὑψηλῆς τῇ φρονήσεως· οἱ καὶ διαμέλουν ὡς ἔπ' αὐτῶν, ἀνέλκειν τῇ Σαβελλίῳ γνώμῃ· ὁ μὲν γὰρ βλασφημεῖ αὐτὸν τῷ ὅν ἐστι λέγων τῷ πατέρα· καὶ ἑμπαλιν· οἱ δὲ τρεῖς θεοὺς τρέπον τινὰ κηρύττειν, εἰς τρεῖς ὑποστάσεις ξένας· ἀλλήλων παντάπασι κεχωρισμένας, διαρρήσας τῇ ἀγίᾳ μονάδᾳ. And in another place, Athanas. Epist. de Sentent. Dionysii, Ὁὕτω μὲν ἡμεῖς εἰς τὴν τριάδα τῇ μονάδᾳ πλασιώμεθα ἀδιαίρετον, καὶ τῇ τριάδᾳ πάλιν ἀμείωτον εἰς τῇ μονάδᾳ συγκεφαλαιώμεθα.

*nitatis diversionem præsumunt Unitatis, quando Unitas ex seipsa derivans Trinitatem, non destruat ab illa, sed administretur. So as for 'Α-  
 ρωεῖς and 'Αδιαίρετον, they answer exactly to  
 Tertullian's Non separatum, c. 8. Hæc erit pa-  
 rabola veritatis, custos Unitatis, qua prolatum  
 dicimus Filium à Patre sed non separatum :  
 which also answers very exactly to Justin's ἕκαστος  
 Ἀποτομῶν, as Ἀπομερίζουσιν τὴν πατρὸς ἐκείνου, as  
 in the Margin before. In my Opinion, he might  
 as well have drawn an Argument against the Stile  
 and Language of this Epistle of Dionys. Romanus  
 cited by Athanasius, from the word Μοναρχία for  
 God, or the one God, in the preceding Citation,  
 which yet before the time of Dionysius was from  
 the use of the word in Greek Writers, made free of  
 the Latin Church, as Mr. W. may see in Tertull. de  
 cult. fem. c. 6. & contra Prax. c. 3. But any thing  
 was to be said to render Athanasius suspected of  
 forging that Epistle.*

*St. Cyprian also, contemporary with Dionysius  
 Romanus, in his Epistle to Jubaianus, the LXXIII<sup>a</sup>  
 in the Oxford Edition, twice uses the Word Tri-  
 nity. Data est mihi omnis potestas in cœlo, &  
 in terra : Itē ergo, & docete gentes omnes, &c.  
 Insinuat Trinitatem, cujus Sacramento gentes  
 baptizarentur. Nunquid hanc Trinitatem Mar-  
 cion tenet? Again, Quando ipse Christus gen-  
 tes baptizari jubeat in plenâ & adunatâ Trinita-  
 te. Where I observe again, that adunata an-  
 swers most exactly to the ἀδιαίρετον of Dionysius.  
 These Testimonies prove the words in Dionysius's*



lii      *Some Account of Dr. GRABE,*

*Epistle, to be the Style and Language of the Age in which he wrote, and they are the Testimonies of Anti-Nicene Fathers, who were not Athanasians, nor by consequence any of those who dropped or suppressed the Arian Accounts; nor any of those Orthodox, abusively so called by Mr. Whiston, I should have said nor any of those Myriads of Orthodox, who for 1300 Years together, have not been so happy as to discover the <sup>y</sup> Ignorance, Knavery, and Forgeries of Athanasius, which Mr. Whiston thinks he hath so happily found out.*

*Dr. Grabe, in the second P. of the following Tract, tells us, that in Mr. Whiston's Collection, he hath observed very many superfluous things, little or nothing at all to the purpose. Such are the rest of the Testimonies cited by him out of Justin, under his fourth Article; and that of Melito Sardensis is so far from being to his purpose, that it is a noble Testimony against him, and, as Mr. Ibbetson observes in his very <sup>z</sup> Judicious Sermon, shews that if the Works of that Father were extant, they would not help his Cause. I refer the learned Reader to the Passage, either in the learned Dr. Cave's Historia Literaria, or in Mr. Wh's own Account of the Faith of the two first Centuries, p. 94. or in the Sermon just now mentioned, to which let me add the Testimony of Eusebius, who expressly reckons <sup>a</sup> Irenæus and Melito*

<sup>y</sup> Athan. convicted of Forgery, p. 2. I durst undertake to satisfy them, and the World, as to the Ignorance, Knavery, and Forgeries of Athanasius, p. 4.

<sup>z</sup> P. 20.

<sup>a</sup> Τα ἄ Εἰρηναίου τε καὶ Μελίωνος καὶ τῶν λοιπῶν τῆς ἀγνοεῖς βιβλία, δεῖν καὶ ἀθεσπῶν καὶ ἀγέλλων τὰ Χριστοῦ. H. Eccl. l.v.c. 28.

amongst

amongst the known Advocates for the Divinity of our ever blessed Saviour, no less than for his Humanity, against Artemon and Paulus Samosatensis, and their followers. Mr. Ibbetson's Observation is just, that Θεὸς ὁ ὢν ὁμοῦ τῷ ἄνθρωπῳ· τέλει might be translated, both perfect God, and perfect Man. But if translated as Mr. Whiston doth, God, and perfect Man, he would do well to consider how he could be τέλει ἄνθρωπος, as <sup>b</sup> St. Ignatius also calls our Lord, without a rational Soul, which is the essential Form of Man. As little to his purpose also is that famous Epistle of <sup>c</sup> Pliny, wherein he tells Trajan, that they met on a certain Day, before it was light, to sing alternately an Hymn to Christ, as God.

There are many more Passages as little to Mr. W's Design, in his Account of the Faith of the two first Centuries, which it would be too long to observe here, and to shew more particularly, that all he hath said under his viii<sup>th</sup> Article, to prove that Jesus Christ is far inferior to his Father in Nature, Attributes and Perfection, is also as little to his purpose, admitting the ancient Explication or Distinction of what is said of our Lord in the Scriptures, κατ' οἰκονομίαν, or ἐπ' αὐτῷ οἰκονομίαν, or οἰκονομικῶς, that is, <sup>d</sup> according to a Mystery couched or implied in those Texts, which speak of

---

<sup>b</sup> Ad Smyrn. 'Αυτὸς μὲ ἐνδυναμῶντ' ὁ τέλει Ἄνθρωπος ἡγο-  
μένῃ.

<sup>c</sup> L. 10. Epist. 98.

<sup>d</sup> Est enim 'Οικονομία Provincia Christo à Deo Patre injuncta & mandata. Et 'Οικονομικῶς non sine mysterio, & certâ ratione, & ut res quæ gerébatur, significat. Budæ. Commentar. Græc. Ling.

*Christ as inferior or subordinate to the Father. For the word οἰκονομία in the very Greek Testament often implies some Mystery, or all the Mysteries of the Gospel-dispensation, as Col. i. 25. Wherein I am made a Minister [ἐν τῇ οἰκονομίᾳ τοῦ Θεοῦ] according to the dispensation of God to fulfil the Word of God, the Mystery, which hath been hid from Ages, and from Generations, but now is made manifest to his Saints. So 1 Tim. i. 4. we find οἰκονομίαν [as it should be read, and not οἰκονομίαν] Θεοῦ καὶ ἐν πίστει, which minister questions, rather than the Godly Dispensation of Faith. So 1 Cor. ix. 17. οἰκονομία is rendred the Dispensation of the Gospel. So Ephes. i. 9, 10. Having made known unto us the Mystery of his Will — εἰς οἰκονομίαν, that in the Dispensation of the fulness of times he might gather together into one all things in Christ. From this relation of the word οἰκονομία to all, or some of the Gospel-Mysteries, of which the Apostles were the οἰκονόμοι, Stewards, or Dispensers, it came to be Technically used by the Fathers to denote Mystery, or what had the Gospel-Mystery couched and involved in it, as in the Epistle of St. Ignatius to the Ephesians, Ὁ ὃς Θεὸς ἡμῶν Ἰησοῦς ὁ Χριστὸς ἐκνομοποίησεν καὶ Μαρίας κατ' οἰκονομίαν Θεοῦ, ἐκ ἀνθρώπου καὶ Δαβὶδ, πνεύματι ὃ ἅγιον, for Jesus Christ our God, according to the divine Dispensation or Mystery, was conceived in the Womb of Mary of the Seed of David, and by the Holy Ghost. Here is one great Mystery of Faith, or one Gospel-Mystery, the Incarnation of God, expressed by κατ' οἰκονομίαν.*



and of his Manuscripts, &c. Iv

οἰκονομίαν, which is also in the interpolated Epistle, but the undoubted true one in Mr. Whiston's Account. The Hereticks, as Bp. Pearson observes, also used the word in the same manner; and in the first place, where it is so used in Irenæus contra Hær. lib. 1. 6. of the late Paris Edition, ἀπὸ τοῦ τῆς οἰκονομίας συνεπεβέβηκε σωμὴ ψυχικῶν ἔχον ὑπόστασιν, the learned Father Mossuet hath this Observation. Hic enim sermo est de iis, quæ servator in terris gessit ad procurandam humani generis salutem, quorum caput, ac principium est incarnatio, quæ Græcis unâ voce dicuntur οἰκονομία. So Lib. 4. Cap. 62. Et in filium Dei Christum Jesum Dom. nostrum, per quam omnia, Καὶ τὰς οἰκονομίας αὐτοῦ, δι' ὧν Ἄνθρωπος ἐγένετο, & dispositiones ejus, per quas homo factus est filius Dei. So Lib. iii. Cap. xix. Where Irenæus proving that it was not Christ, but the Holy Spirit, which descended upon Jesus, and which he having receiv'd from the Father, gave to the Church; he writes thus: Τὸ Πνεῦμα ἅγιον κατέβη ἐκ τοῦ Θεοῦ διὰ τὴν προεπιστάμενην οἰκονομίαν, καὶ τὸ ὕψος τοῦ Θεοῦ γνωστοποιῦντες — Σαρκωθέντες ἐν ἄνθρωπῳ καὶ α / ω  
πάντων τῶν κατ' Ἄνθρωπον οἰκονομίαν ἐκπληρώσαντες τὸ Κυρεῖν ἡμῶν Ἰησοῦ, κ. τ. λ. Here οἰκονομία in the first place relates unto the descent of the Holy Ghost, and in the second to the Incarnation of Christ, and all that he did and suffered for us upon Earth. So Just. Mart. Qui ex Virgine ista — caro factus, nasci sustinuit, [ἵνα διὰ τῆς οἰκονομίας ταύτης] ut per Oeconomiam hanc malignus à principio serpens, & ipsius similes Angeli

geli debellarentur. So p. 331. A. Archelaus vero prius mortuus est, quam Christus [τῷ οἰκονομικῷ πλὴν τοῦ βεβλήμενου καὶ πατρὸς γεγενημένῳ] secundum *Oeconomiam* [Provinciam] Patris sibi mandatum crucifigeretur. So in his *Epist.* ad Droghetum, p. 499. But God, saith he, was, and is, and shall be always benign, and good, and patient, and true, and is only good, and [Ἐν νοήσας ὃ μεγάλην καὶ ἀφραστον ἔννοιαν] having conceived in his Mind a great and ineffable Conception, which he communicated only to his Son, ἐν ὅσῳ μόνῳ ἐν κατεῖκεν ἐν μυστηρίῳ, καὶ διετήρει τῷ σοφίᾳ αὐτῷ βεβλήν. As long therefore as he detained and kept up his all-wise Counsel in Mystery or Secret—πάντα ἐν ᾗ δει παρ' ἐαυτῷ συν τῷ πατρὶ οἰκονομικῶς, therefore he knew all things of himself with his Son, by his *OEconomical* or secret Knowledge; and in his Dialogue with Trypho, p. 334. he saith, that the Gourd which overshadowed Jonas, grew up διὰ τῆς οἰκονομίας, by the secret Order and Appointment of God. And p. 371. that there was Οἰκονομία τις καὶ μυστήριον, an *OEconomy* and Mystery in the Patriarchs having many Wives.

Οἰκονομία is rendred by *Dispositio* in the Latin Translator of Irenæus, and in Tertullian, as also by *Dispensatio* by the latter. † Nos vero & semper, & nunc magis, ut instructiores per paracletum deductorem scilicet veritatis, unicum quidem Deum credimus, sub hac tamen *Dispensa-*

---

† *Adversus Prax.* Cap. 2.

*tionem quam Œconomiam dicimus, ut unicus Dei sit & filius sermo ipsius, qui ex ipso processerit— Hunc missum à Patre in Virginem, & ex ea natura hominem, & Deum, filium hominis & filium Dei, & cognominatum Jesum Christum. Here Œconomia is applied to the Mystery of the Trinity, as well as to the Incarnation of the second Person, and so afterwards is applied again to the Mystery of the Holy Trinity. Nihilominus custodiatur Œconomia Sacramentum quæ Unitatem in Trinitatem disponit, tres dirigens, Patrem, & Filium, & Spiritum Sanctum. So again, Cap. 3. Numerum, & dispositionem Trinitatis divisionem præsumunt unitatis, quando unitas ex seipsa derivans Trinitatem, non destruat ab illa, sed administretur.*

*I have said enough to shew, that Œconomia is a Technical Term in the ancient Christian Divinity, founded in the Writings of the Apostles, and that it was used in this Technical Signification before the Arian Controversie, to denote first the great Mysteries of the Holy Trinity, and the Derivation of the λόγος, or Son from the Father, and of the Holy Spirit from the Father, and the Son, or from the Father through the Son, and the other Mysteries relating to the Trinity, as the personal Distinction of one of them from the other, and the Subordination of the Son to the Father, and of the Holy Spirit to them both.*

*Secondly, That it was in those early times used to denote the Incarnation of the Son, and all the Mysteries relating to that, before the time of*



*Athanasius, and thereby to explain the true sense and meaning of those Words or Expressions in the holy Writings or others, which seem not to agree with the essential Equality of the three Persons in the Holy Trinity; particularly with the essential Equality of the Word with the Father, either as the Son of God, or as the Son of Man, or as the Θεάνθρωπος, both God, and Man. Thus the word is used in this remarkable Passage of Origen, in his Commentary upon St. John's Gospel, p. 142.*

*Οὐτός ἐστιν ὁ ἀμνὸς τοῦ Θεοῦ, ὁ ἄρων τὴν ἀμαρτίαν τοῦ κόσμου, ἱερεῖς ἐπ' αὐτῷ τὴν οἰκονομίαν τῆς σωματικῆς. ἢ ἢ δὲ εἰς τὸ ἀνθρώπων βίον ἐπιδημίας, &c. This is the Lamb of God that taketh away the Sins of the World: Which being understood according to the OEconomy or Dispensation of the bodily coming of the Son of God into a human Life, we shall not conceive the Lamb to be any thing but Man. For he was led as a Sheep to the slaughter, and was mute as a Lamb before his Shearers; saying, I am brought as an innocent Lamb to be sacrificed. And again, in the Catena upon St. John; Ταῦτα ἡ ὑσίας ἢ λόγος εἰπὼν, σιωπᾷ ἕως καὶ πάλιν τῆς ἐπιδημίας αὐτοῦ λέγων, ὁ ὀπίσω μὲν ἐρχόμενος. Upon which Passage, Suicer in his Thesaurus writes thus. Cum hæc nempe μέσθῃ ἢ ὑμῶν ἔστηκεν ὃν ὑμεῖς οὐκ οἴδατε, de substantia verbi protulisset, adjicit deinceps, quæ adventus ejus, id est, Incarnationi, conveniunt, dicens: Qui post me venturus est. I do not think it to my purpose to*

*recite*

recite other Examples after the Nicene Council, which are already collected to my hand, many of which he may see in the said Thesaurus, in the words 'Οἰκονομία & 'Οἰκονομῶς. I say, I do not think it to my purpose, because whatever regard others may have for them, Mr. Whiston will call them Athanasian Explications, and Postnicene. Only let me observe, that the Council of Nice it self which consisted of Antenicene Fathers, used the term : Ἡ τῆς ἐνορέξε τῷ υἱ τῷ Θεῷ παρθεσίας οἰκονομία, the [mysterious] OEconomy of the Appearance of the Son of God in the Flesh. Act. Synod. Nic. p. 5. And if Mr. Whiston will admit this Explication and Distinction to be applied to the Authorities produced by him out of the Scriptures, or out of the ancient Fathers, in his eighth or any other Article of the Account of the Faith of the two first Centuries, they will appear, as Dr. Grabe saith in the following Tract, little or nothing to his purpose. Even that famous Passage of Origen, in his second Article, which by his own confession he produces contrary to the Father's own Example and Doctrine also, if rightly understood with this ancient Explication, will stand him in no stead, but fully reconcile Origen to himself. For though the solemn Devotions of the Church in her Liturgies, were put up to God the Father through the Son, (as all the Apologists observe) according to the Christian OEconomy, founded in the personal Dignity of the Father above the Son, yet

**IX      Some Account of Dr. GRABE,**

Mr. Whiston cannot deny that they also used to sing Hymns immediately to Christ as God: Not to mention St. Stephen's Prayer, Lord Jesu receive my Spirit; nor the solemn Prayer of St. John, Amen, even so come Lord Jesus, come quickly: I have already cited the Authority of Pliny for the Christians singing Hymns to Christ as God; and not to mention the ὑμνὸς ἑωθινός, or Glory be to God on high, &c. in use long before the Council of Nice, (as Dr. Smith has shewn to be no improbable Conjecture) the truth of this Assertion will sufficiently appear from what we find in Eusebius and S. Basil, not in relation to their own Times, but to those which were long before them. The former of whom<sup>f</sup> speaking of the Heresie of Artemon, and Paulus Samosatenus, who would allow our Saviour to be no more than<sup>g</sup> a mere Man, brings in an ancient Author affirming, that what the Followers of Artemon pleaded for themselves, viz. that they had all the Ancients to the time of Pope Victor, and even the holy Apostles on their side, might pass perhaps as probable, were it not that the holy Scriptures are against them, and the writings of some Authors who lived before Victor, and then wrote against the Heathens in behalf of the true Religion, and against the Hereticks of those times. Of these be instances in Justin, and Miltiades, and Tatian,

---

<sup>f</sup> Hist. Eccl. l. 5. c. 28.

<sup>g</sup> Ψιλὸν ἀνθρώπον.

and



and <sup>h</sup> Clemens, <sup>i</sup> by each of whom, as well as divers others, the Divinity of Christ was taught. To them he adds also Irenæus and Melito, as I have observed before, and others to this purpose, whose words were then sufficiently known; affirming moreover, that <sup>k</sup> there were Psalms and Songs of the Brethren, even from the beginning, written by the faithful, wherein the Word of God, even Christ, was praised, and his Divinity professed. And in another place <sup>l</sup> he saith of Firmilian <sup>m</sup> that he had experience of Paulus Samosatenus's wicked Denial of our Saviour's Divinity, <sup>n</sup> having been deceived by a Man who denied his God and Lord, and kept not the Faith he had formerly professed. And a little after he charges Paulus, not in his own Name, but in the Name of the Synod then convened, with discarding the Psalms, or Hymns, in <sup>o</sup> honour of our

---

<sup>k</sup> That is Clemens Alexandrinus, whose Authority Dr. Grabe vindicates in the following Tract, against the Exceptions of Mr. Whiston. And as to the Authority of that Father, whether we shall take the Testimony of Eusebius, (for whom Mr. Whiston himself hath expressed so much respect) or that of Mr. Whiston, let learned Men judge.

<sup>i</sup> Ἐν οἷς ἅπασιν θεολογείῃ ὁ Χριστός. Where by the way I would observe, that in the Antenicene Times, θεολογία was frequently used in contradistinction to the aforementioned οἰκονομία, as may be seen at the end of this Discourse.

<sup>k</sup> Ψαλμοὶ ὅσοι, καὶ ὡσαύτ' ἀδελφῶν ἀπ' ἀρχῆς ὑπὸ πνεύματος γεγραμμένοι, καὶ λόγον ἔχοντες καὶ χριστὸν ὑμνεῖσιν θεολογῶντες.

<sup>l</sup> L. 7. c. 30.

<sup>m</sup> Τῆς ἀρετῆς αὐτῆς κακίας ποιεῖν εἰληώς.

<sup>n</sup> Παρακρουθεὶς ὑπὸ αὐτῆς καὶ ἔχοντα αὐτῆς κύνειον ἀρετῆς, καὶ πείσιν ἢ καὶ αὐτὸς περὶ τερνὴν ἔχει μὴ φυλάξαι.

<sup>o</sup> Ψαλμὸς ὅς ποτε εἰς τὸ κύνειον ἡμῶν Ἰησοῦν χριστὸν παύσας· ὡς ὁ νεώτερος καὶ νεώτερος ἀνδρῶν (συγγραμματα· εἰς αὐτὸν ὁ

**lxiii    Some Account of Dr. GRABE,**

our Lord Jesus Christ, charging them, *as Mr. Whiston now does whatever makes against him, as not ancient and genuine, but as new, and the Composures of some late Authors; and getting some Women in the Body of the Church, and even on the great Day of Easter to sing Hymns in praise of himself, such as one would tremble to hear.*

*Thus far not only Eusebius, but such as lived long before him, plainly testifie their Belief of the Divinity of Christ, by censuring and condemning the Denial of it; which they could never have been supposed to do, had they been of Mr. Whiston's Opinion. But which having done, they leave no room for imagining this Doctrine of our Saviour's Divinity, to be, <sup>P</sup> as he will needs have it, against almost all the Evidence and Authorities of the Antenicene Fathers.*

*And that Doxologies and Hymns were sung of old, not only to the Son, but to the Holy Ghost too, St. Basil <sup>Q</sup> testifies from Origen, Julius Africanus, Gregory Thaumaturgus, and Firmilian, who all lived in the third Century. And having spoken of several that glorified both the Son, and the Holy Ghost, and more particularly of Irenæus, Clemens Romanus, and Dionysius Romanus, to these he adds Dionysius of Alexandria, who in his second Epistle*

---

ἐν μέσῃ τῇ Ἐκκλησίᾳ, τῇ μεγάλῃ τῇ πάλαι ἡμεῖς τὰς γυναι-  
 κας ψαλμοῦσιν ᾠδοῦσιν, ὧν καὶ ἀκούς ἂν τις φείξεν.

<sup>P</sup> Valef. Annot. in Euseb. H. E. l. 7. 29.

<sup>Q</sup> De Spiritu Sancto. c. 29.

to the now mentioned Dionysius of Rome, concludes thus. \* Agreeably to all whose Sentiments, we also, according to the Pattern and Rule that we have received from those Ancients that have been before us, with one Voice give thanks together with them, and cease writing to you any farther. But to God the Father, and to the Son our Lord Jesus Christ, with the Holy Ghost, be Glory and Power for ever and ever. Amen.

Here the same Glory and Power that is given to the Father, is also given to the Son with the Holy Ghost, by Dionysius Alex. and I think I have vindicated the other Dionysius from the Exceptions of Mr. Whiston; but perhaps he will arbitrarily reject him, because he was a Father of the third Century, though he lived so long before the Dispute between Alexander Bp. of Alexandria, and his Presbyter Arius, and by consequence before the Christian World was disturbed by the Arian Heresy.

Mr. Whiston I hope will not take it ill from me, if I say that I believe he rejects the Testimonies of the third Century, for the sake of Tertullian, and St. Cyprian, in whose Writings he can find nothing agreeable to his Arian Schemes, and his artful Account of the Faith of the two

---

\* Τάτοις, φησὶ πᾶσιν ἀκολουθῶντες καὶ ἡμεῖς, καὶ ὁ καὶ παρ' αὐτῶν περὶ ἡμῶν πρεσβυτέρων τύπον καὶ κανόνα παρεληφότες, ὁμοφώνως τε αὐτοῖς προσάχαισθῆναι, καὶ δὴ καὶ νῦν ἐπισέλλοντες, καταπαύσομεν. Τῷ δὲ Θεῷ καὶ πατρὶ καὶ υἱῷ καὶ κυρίῳ ἡμῶν Ἰησοῦ Χριστῷ, ὧν πᾶς ἀγίῳ πνεύματι, δόξα καὶ κράτος εἰς τοὺς αἰῶνας τῶν αἰώνων. Ἀμήν.



first Centuries; but on the contrary, numerous, plain, and weighty Testimonies for the Doctrine of the Holy Trinity, and the Divinity of Christ. But to confirm what I have said above of *Οικο- νομία* and *Θεολογία*, and of the Divinity, or God- head of Christ, I refer the Reader to the two fol- lowing Observations of that great Man, and most profound Divine, Bp. Pearson, in the seventh and eighth Pages of his Annotations on the Epistle of St. Ignatius to the Church of Smyrna, published at Oxford, by the late reverend, and very lear- ned Dr. Thomas Smith, in the Year MDCCIX.

P. I. v. 14. *Δοξάζω Ἰησοῦν Χριστὸν τὸ Θεόν*] Vetus interpres, *Glorifico Jesum Christum Deum*. In MS. legitur *δοξάζων*, satis bene. Interpolat- or pro sua libidine, *Δοξάζω τὸ Θεόν καὶ πατέρα Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ* quibus verbis sententiam Ignatii de vera & summa divinitate Christi obscuravit, quam tamen ipse Ignatius semper aperte agno- scit & profitetur. Non aliter intelligi potest— *διωρεὰ τῷ Θεῷ* in hac ipsâ epistolâ; & *ἀγαθόνες Χριστοῦ Θεῷ* in epistolâ ad Polycarpum; *ὅτι Θεῷ ἡμῶν Ἰησοῦ Χριστῷ* in epistolâ ad Ephesios, καὶ αὐ- τοῦ ἢ ὅτι ἡμῖν Θεὸς ἡμῶν, & λαβόντες Θεῷ γινώσκιν, ὅς ἐστιν Ἰησοῦς Χριστός· & ad Romanos, καὶ πρίν καὶ ἀρχαίῳ τῷ Χριστῷ τῷ Θεῷ ἡμῶν. Quæ omnia ad imitationem S. Johannis & S. Thomæ dicta sunt, qui aperte Christum ἐθεολόγην, ut loquun- tur Veteres, i. e. *diserte nobis ut Deum represen- tabant*. Ita certe Ignatii ætate loquebantur, & qui statim postea secuti sunt. V. Plinii episto- lam ad Trajanum, & Euseb. H. E. l. V. c. 28.

p. 196. & IX. 1. p. 348. D. Clem. Alexandr. 790. A. b. Insignis locus est Origenis adv. Celsum, 230. & in Joan. 139. Arnobius adv. Gentes, l. II. p. 85. *Et ideo Christus, licet vobis invitis, Deus: (Deus inquam Christus.) Hoc enim saepe dicendum est, ut infidelium diffiliat & dirumpatur auditus.* Unde peculiari notione Θεολογία doctrina de deitate Christi: cui opponitur doctrina de humanitate, quæ Οικονομία dicebatur: & Θεολογία dicebantur, quæ tractabant de deitate Christi. Ephraimus apud Phot. 776. 20. De οἰκονομία v. Irenæum l. 4. c. 62. Græce, & p. 80. Vide eundem in penultima paginâ Græcorum fragmentorum. Orig. 129. in Joan. ex Heracleone. Justin. 264. A. 331. A. Οικονομία & Θεολογία Euseb. lib. 1. p. 4. D. Theodoret. proœmio ad Hebræos. Illud etiam ex verbo δοξάζειν apparet, quoniam toties in S. literis occurrit δοξάζειν τὸν Θεόν. In vetustissimâ doxologia in codice Trevirensi ante mille annos descripto, & in codice Cyrilli ante annos mille ducentos:

Κύριε ὁ Θεός,  
Ὁ ἀμνὸς τοῦ Θεοῦ,  
Ὁ υἱὸς τοῦ Πατρὸς.  
Domine Deus,  
Agnus Dei,  
Filius Patris.

Sub nomine περσυχῆς ἰωθινῆς ab ipso Athanasio agnita de Virginitate versus finem: & fortasse ὠδὴ πωλυώνυμοι. à Luciano circa medium secundi seculi notata est; ut observatum est à Viro

lvxi *Some Account of Dr. GRABE,*

erudito, & Amico nostro, *Smitho Oxoniensi.*  
Hoc maxime notabile, quod vetustissimi Chri-  
stiani Christum Deum simpliciter vocabant: po-  
steriores Hæretici *Dominum* tantum. V. Phœba-  
dium.

Ibid. Τὸν Θεόν.] Christum vocat Ignatius De-  
um cum articulo. Ephraim. apud Phot. Cod.  
CCXXVIII, pag. 810. 21. Καὶ ὁ Θεοφύλακτος ὁ  
Ἰγνατίου καὶ μάρτυς Συμωναίου ὁπισθέλλων ὁμοίως λέ-  
χεται τῷ ἄνθρωπῳ. eo sc. modo, quo antè S. Mat-  
thæus & S. Paulus, non tantum in casu recto,  
sed etiam in obliquo. De Articulo in Jo. 109.  
B. ipse tamen usurpat contra Cels. 321, 322,  
323, 325. Valesius in epistolâ ad Abgarum a-  
pud Euseb. in annotationibus pag. 22. condem-  
nat vulgarem lectionem, ὁ κωλύει ἡμῶν καὶ Θεός  
Ἰησοῦς ὁ Χρῆστος, propter auctoritatem aliquorum  
MSS. & rationem addit duplicem, quarum neu-  
tra mihi probatur. Artemon Hæreticus post  
Apostolos fatebatur, Christianos Christum Θεο-  
λογῆσαι. Theodoret. IV. 220. B. Quum dixisset  
Libanius Sophista de Christianis, τὸν ἐκ Παλαιστι-  
νης ἄνθρωπον Θεόν τε καὶ Θεῷ παῖδα ποιῆσαι, *Hominem*  
*quendam ex Palestina Deum Deique filium fa-*  
*ciunt*; rectè ei respondit Socrates III. 23. ὅπως  
παρ' ἡμῶν, &c. p. 201. quem consule. An inde ve-  
teres inscriptiones I. X. Θ. Ἰησοῦς Χρῆστος Θεός;  
unde IXΘΥΣ Tertulliani. V. Rudgerf. Var. Lect.  
I. I. c. I.

*Unto these Testimonies about OIKONOMIA, to*  
*which this most learned Bishop refers, let me*  
*add one very remarkable out of Origen's Com-*

-ments

men-



mentaries on St. John, p. 98. where citing Mat. xiii. 17. He saith the Prophets desired to [see *Ὁμιλέμην τοῦ Μυστηρίου τὸ τὸ ἦν τὸ Θεοῦ ἐνωμα- τώσεως, καὶ κατεδόσεως ἐν τῷ Ὁμιλούμεν τὸ Σωματι- κοῖς νόμοις πατρὸς αὐτοῦ,*] the *Œconomical Mystery* of the Incarnation of the Son of God, and of his descending to accomplish the *Œconomy* of his Pas- sion for the Salvation of many. This also puts me in mind of the same Father's Testimony for the Holy Adorable Trinity in the same Commen- taries, p. 124. where he saith, that our being washed in Baptism with Water, is a Symbol of the Purification of the Soul, which is cleansed from all the flesh of Sin, and yet of it self is also the Principle and Fountain of Divine Graces, through the Power of the Invocations [*καὶ προσευχῶν τρια- δῶν*] of the Adorable Trinity, to him, who pre- sents himself [*θεοῦμεν*] to God. This also may shew Mr. Whifton that *Τριάς*, and by consequence its correlat, *Μόνας*, was the early Language of the third Century, and therefore that the use of those words or any others relating to them, is no Argu- ment to make the Epistle of Dionysius Rom. suspe- cted, much less to be suspected as a Forgery of St. Athanasius, as he would make us believe.

I had here concluded my Discourse of the vene- rable Dr. Grabe, and his MSS, but that I recei- ved the following Letter relating to him, from a learned Gentleman, with which I conclude this Discourse.

SIR,

**H**Earing that you are about publishing a Discourse concerning Dr. Grabe, and thinking you may not perhaps have been so intimately acquainted with him as I have been, especially as to some not inconsiderable Particulars of his Life, I shall here offer you a few Notices concerning him, which you may dispose of as you please. His Character is sufficiently known in general to the learned World, and especially to them who had the satisfaction of any near Acquaintance with him; but there are few, I believe, that are duly appriz'd of that Exactness which I have often admir'd in him, as to all things he seriously set about. Hence he was no less diligent and curious in searching out all that he could ever find of the ancient Hereticks, as well as of the Orthodox, that so he might examine the one by the other, in order to form a right Judgment of both. And for the same reason he thought it not enough to search with indefatigable Pains the Canonical Books of the Old and New Testaments, both in their Originals and ancient Versions, without having recourse also to those Apocryphal ones of both Testaments, or the Fragments of them which are extant; and he wish'd but a little while before he dy'd, that more of the Apocryphal Books of the Old Testament, which were written by the Hellenist Jews, could be recovered; because he thought they might contribute not a little to the more exact Knowledge of the Scripture, and the deter-

and of his Manuscripts, &c. Ixix

determining the true sense of some controverted Passages. But more particularly in the Examination of his Religion, there was such a Sincerity and Exactness, as I am persuaded will be very difficult to parallel in any, there being but exceeding few that can so perfectly lay aside all the Prejudices of their Education, together with the Prospect of all secular Advantages and Honours, and the Interest and Affection of their dearest Friends and Relations, and so readily and chearfully forsake all, out of a pure Love towards the Truth, without regard to any one Person or Party whatsoever, as he did; that so he might find a true and solid Satisfaction within him, by the Truth setting him free. And howsoever some may accuse him of too much Credulity, there was no Man in reality farther than he, from suffering himself to be determined by the Opinions and Dictates of any Church, because established by Law, or from being dazzled with Wordly Splendour and Power. Of this there are many unquestionable Proofs that can easily be produced. And though he was not indeed for an unbounded liberty of thinking, yet most certain it is from the whole Process of his Life and Studies, that he was not for taking up any thing in matters of Religion upon trust, or upon an implicate Faith, but was for bringing them all to the Test, and comparing them with the Originals. This was the occasion to him for a good while of a great many Doubts and Scruples concerning that Communion of Christians wherein he was born and educated, as also concerning the  
several



lxx *Some Account of Dr. GRABE,*

*several other Communions of them, both in the East and West, with all of which he labour'd to acquaint himself, by the exactest Information that could possibly be got, before he could arrive at any Settlement, or be able to fix his Notion of the Catholick Church, and of the true Communion therein by Apostolical Faith and Charity. This cost him very dear, as I have heard him complain; but when he had bought the Truth, he was resolved not to sell it for all that the World could give him in exchange. He was tempted at sundry Times, and after sundry Manners, but could by no means be prevailed on to part with his Purchase which he had made, or to let go the Peace of his Conscience: And this, I assure you, Sir, was no small Comfort to him, when he had the Prospect of Death before his Eyes. However, he condemn'd himself at the same time for some Steps taken by him at his first setting out, which in his riper Years he judged to be too precipitate, yet acknowledged both in that, and in all the whole course of his Life, the marvellous Conduct of Divine Providence. For from his natural Temper, he was apt to be too earnest upon the Discoveries which he made, and this might sometimes carry him a little too far; and to correct this he was at very great Pains. But at length he arriv'd to so great a Mastery of his Genius herein, without spoiling by this the Vivacity of it, as to be able steadily to hold the true Mean in most, or all the Controversies of Religion, having nothing in this World to byass him for one side*  
*more*

*and of his Manuscripts, &c. lxxi*

*more than for another. With this Indifferency and Impartiality, he betook himself to the Examination of the Christian Religion, and of the Claims of the several contending Parties, earnestly praying to God in the words of St. Chrysostom, to grant him in this World Knowledge of his Truth, and in the World to come Life everlasting: Words, with which he did shew himself exceedingly delighted, saying to me again and again, that they were so comprehensive as to contain all that it was fit for him to desire. And particularly in his Enquiry concerning the Object of our Worship, that he might be preserved from every degree of Idolatry, and every Mistake herein: he omitted nothing that could be done by him, in order to attain as full a Satisfaction as the holy Scriptures, and the most ancient Witnesses of our Religion can give us.*

*'Tis certain he studied this Point between the Catholicks and Arians with the utmost Application; and not only while we had the Happiness to enjoy him here in England, but for several Years before he set himself to sift thoroughly the whole matter from the beginning, and to examine candidly what might be said on both sides. His Method herein was to write down first the Testimonies of the Fathers, then the Answers or Evasions which were made to them, whether by Catholicks or Hereticks; and some time after that, Exceptions to those Answers, and new Answers again to those Exceptions, or Replies. Thus he was for a long while making a Collection of the*  
*Testimo-*

lxxii *Some Account of Dr. GRABE,*

*Testimonies of Antiquity, both for and against the Catholick Doctrine of the ever blessed Trinity, and the Incarnation of our Lord, which he could meet with either Printed, or in Manuscript, by his diligent searching of Libraries. And the very same Method he fell into with respect to the Controversies, which divide the Greek and Latin Church, and this latter, and the Protestants. An occasion of his falling into this Method, seems to have been the high Pretension to Antiquity of the famous Christopher Sandius, or Sanden, that great Reviver of Arianism, who was not only his Countryman, but of the same Town also and University with him; whence his Father Dr. Sylvester Grabe, his Contemporary, read several Lectures against this Sandius, being then Rector of the University at Coningsberg; in which he clearly demonstrated the gross Mistakes, and Misrepresentations of that Author; some of which he printed, particularly those which relate to the Controversie about the famous Passage in St. John, concerning the three Witnesses in Heaven, whether genuine or interpolated, whence Dr. Milles seems to have had no small Assistance in his writing that learned Dissertation on that Text; and which are now found among the Manuscripts of the Son, with large Notes and Additions both of the Father and the Son, in order to another more complete Edition, as it seems. And as the Father began, his Son Ernestus indefatigably prosecuted the Design, having at first several Scruples upon him, both concerning these, and some other*  
Points



*Points of Faith and Practice generally received among those of the Communion wherein he was born. It appears, I say, that he was sometimes in his younger Years, a little in suspense upon his weighing the Testimonies and Reasons on both sides. But he came at length by this Method to be most fully satisfy'd; and so died in firm Faith and Assurance of Mercy according to the Catholick Belief which he had received, and by his Books declared. But as it was his manner to write down from time to time, whatever presented it self for one side or for the other, for the most part in loose Papers only, that so the same might be afterwards by him digested, and then transcribed; it is to be fear'd we have by this means lost a good part of his Collections and laborious Researches after Truth, and more especially those relating to the present Controversie; unless perhaps some of his Papers that concern this great Subject were put by him into the hands of some of his Friends, and forgotten, as it happen'd also to his Friend Bp. Bull, who was engaged with him in the same Cause. For among the many MSS, Tracts and Papers which he has left behind him, there appears no want of such as relate to the Controversies betwixt the Church of Rome and the Protestants, or the Disputes betwixt the Greeks and the Latins, wherewith he was accurately acquainted; but there is visibly a considerable Defect in the Collections upon the Trinitarian Controversie, which he had been with such indefatigable Industry making for so many Years. For*

**lxxiv**    *Some Account of Dr. GRABE,*

*in a Latin Apology for the Catholicks against the Arians, which seems to have been written by him near twenty Years ago, there want no less than thirty two Sections in the beginning, besides the End, which might be either unfinished, or not transcribed. And the Testimonies for the Catholick Doctrine found among his Papers, are not only few, but very lately written too, and most probably since the Affair of Mr. Whiston. The Testimonies also for the Arian Opinion, which he had likewise collected before his coming into England, or transcribed from his Countryman Sandius, in order to be better consider'd, have nothing left but the very beginning. So that this most elaborate Collection of Testimonies on both sides with the several Answers, Exceptions and Rejoinders, which are mention'd in one of his English Fragments, and which he took notice of to Mr. Whiston himself, as well as to some others with much concern, is not to be found.*

*But though he was so well furnish'd with Materials, and for more than twenty Years had made it his business chiefly to consider this Controversie, and to know perfectly all that had been said or done in the same; yet such was his great Modesty, as he forbore to publish any thing about it one way or the other, that he might better consider, as he said, of so weighty and so mysterious a Point as this [of the Blessed Trinity] is; till he was at length very providentially called to publish the learned Labours of Bp. Bull, written in vindication of the Common Faith, and to add strength*  
to

*and of his Manuscripts, &c. lxxv*

*to the same by some Annotations of his own; for which, he from the said Bishop received all the Acknowledgment that it was possible for him to make to one whom he look'd on as the greatest Ornament to his Profession. The like Acknowledgments he had from a great many others of the most learned Men in the several Parts of Europe: And Bishop Bull was not the only Person that submitted his Notes, even his very last Notes, upon this great Point, to be freely used of by him, ther by adding or striking out whatever he should think fit.*

*As he was as perfect a Master of this Controversie as the learned World could wish, yet being engag'd in other most laborious Designs, and pressing still to obtain further Light; his Piety and Veneration for so great and venerable a Mystery of our holy Religion, hindred him from writing any set Treatise on this Subject, of which nevertheless he had laid a Plan, as I am well inform'd, in three Books, hoping he said sometime or other to be at liberty to perfect the same, if God for the service of his Church, should be pleased to make use of him in such a Work.*

*As to his Opinion concerning the Church of England, as the best Reformed Church, and the Separation of our Dissenters from it, you know it perfectly well. But I must not omit to tell you, that he was sensible of the evil Consequence of some Reports concerning the Communion wherein he lived and dyed, as he was also of the Obligation he was under not to reveal the Se-*



lxxvi *Some Account of Dr. GRABE,*

*crets of a Friend, and especially those of Conscience; and that though he thought himself bound not to publish the Names of those worthy Persons, who from his very first coming into England, had been stirred up by God to offer him all spiritual Assistance, in compliance with those Notions of the Sacerdotal Powers, and the sacred Institution of Christ, which he had taken up from the Writers of the three first Centuries; he was nevertheless willing and desirous that after his Death somewhat might be made publick, to declare his dying in the Communion of the Church of England, notwithstanding some Defects (as he apprehended) in its Reformation; and his most hearty Wishes for the Re-union of all Christians, according to the most primitive and perfect Model. That he had some Scruples about communicating publicly in our Churches, at least without he could have an entire Confidence in the Priest that was to officiate, (as in his own Country I know he had) or except in the Case of Necessity, he was very sincere in owning. Notwithstanding this, he had not near that Esteem for any other part of the Cath. Church, as for the Ch. of Eng. and as he counted himself under an indispensable Obligation of Duty to testify his Catholick Communion with all Saints in the holy Eucharist, he declared with a great deal of sensible Satisfaction, that ever since his coming into our Isle, it had pleased God to grant him an Opportunity of receiving the Sacrament according to his Hearts desire, in its most ancient Purity and Perfection;*  
*and*

*and of his Manuscripts, &c. lxxvii*  
*and that he had constantly all this while received*  
*it from such only as were in holy Orders, according*  
*to the Reformed Church of England, for*  
*the Authority of whose Priests and Bishops, and*  
*the Validity of their Orders against the Church*  
*of Rome, he gave all possible Testimonies to the*  
*very last. But I am not writing his Apology,*  
*but declaring a little of what I met with in his*  
*Conversation, than which, I never knew any more*  
*instructive and edifying.*

May 26, 1712.

I am, Sir,  
Yours, &c.

---

**A** Ddend. Page l. Line 1, 2, *after Monarchians, r. as the Noëtians and Sabellians were called.*

---

Some

®

and of his Manuscript; Sec. lxxvii  
and that he had constantly all the while received  
it from him only as were in holy Orders, ac-  
cording to the Reformed Church of England, for  
the Authority of such Priests and Bishops, and  
the Validity of their Orders against the Church  
of Rome, he gave all possible Testimonies to the  
very last. But I am not writing his Apology,  
but declaring a little of what I met with in his  
Confession, then written, & never since any more  
repeated and oblige.

I am Sir,  
Yours Obedt. Servt.

May 25, 1717.

A  
Obedt. Servt. I live & am Monmouth, 7. in the Year  
1717. at London was sent.

Some



~~Two Arabic Manuscripts of the~~  
~~Book of Job, and the ancient Book called~~  
~~the Doctrine of the Apostles, which is said to be~~  
~~existent in them; wherein Mr. W. Jones, M.~~  
Some BOOKS written by Dr. GRABE,  
and sold by HENRY CLEMENTS, at the  
Half-Moon in St. Paul's Churchyard.

**S**picilegium S S. Patrum, ut & Hæreticorum,  
seculi post Christum natum I, II, & III.  
Quorum vel integra monumenta, vel fragmen-  
ta, partim ex aliorum Patrum libris jam impres-  
sis collegit, & cum Codicibus Manuscriptis  
contulit, partim ex MSS. nunc primum edidit,  
ac singula tam Præfatione, quàm Notis sub-  
iunctis illustravit, *Joannes Ernestus Græbius*, D.D.  
2 Tom. 8°.

Septuaginta Interpretum Tomus I. Continens  
Octateuchum. Tomus ultimus, Continens Psal-  
morum, Jobi, ac tres Salomonis libros, cum A-  
pocrypha ejusdem, necnon Siracidæ Sapiëntia;  
quos ex *Alexandrino* Codice descriptos, & ope  
aliorum Exemplarium, ac priscorum Scriptorum,  
præsertim vero Hexaplaris Editionis Origenianæ,  
emendatos atque suppletos, additis sæpissime A-  
steriscorum & Obelorum signis, summa cura e-  
didit *Joannes Ernestus Græbe*, D.D.

Dissertatio de variis vitiis LXX Interpretum  
Versioni ante B. Origenis ævum illatis, & Re-  
mediis ab ipso Hexaplari ejusdem Versionis Edi-  
tione adhibitis, deque hujus Editionis reliquiis  
tam manu scriptis quàm prælo excusis, Auctore  
*Joanne Ernesto Græbe*, D. D.

**An Essay upon Two Arabick Manuscripts of the Bodleian Library, and that ancient Book called *The Doctrine of the Apostles*, which is said to be extant in them; wherein Mr. *Whiston's* Mistakes about both are plain proved; by *John Ernest Grabe*, D. D. The second Edition.**

**Orationes duæ in Theatro Sheldoniano vi Kal. Maii, MDCCVI. (Quo Die Academiae Francofurtanae Encoenia sæcularia ibidem celebrata sunt) habitæ à Rev. Viro *Georgio Smalridge*, S. T. P. altera, cum clariss. Virum *Joh. Ernest. Grabe*, Borossum, ad Doctoratum in S. Theol. Universitati Oxoniensi commendaret; altera cum eundem Insignibus Academicis ornaret.**

**Some**

---

*Some Instances of the Defects and  
Omissions in Mr. WHISTON'S  
Collection of Testimonies, &c.*

**T**HE Treatise upon which I have made the following Remarks, is a Collection of Testimonies from the Writings of the H. Apostles, and the most ancient Fathers, which Mr. *W.* thinks to be opposite to the Faith and Doctrine of the Divinity of Christ and the H. Spirit, and of their Worship, as it hath been declared of old in the two General Councils of *Nice* and *Constantinople*, and as it is now believed, taught and practised in all Christian Churches over the World, particularly in that of *England*, (to which he is in a special manner subject, and obliged by solemn Subscriptions) and even in most of all the Congregations, which *name the Name of Christ*. To which unanimous Consent of so many Ages and Nations, since Mr. *W.* opposeth himself, and begins to set forth quite contrary Notions in the very Fundamental Articles of the Christian Doctrine and Worship, methinks he should proceed with the greatest Humility and Caution imaginable, leaving nothing unconsider'd, which hath been, or might be brought, in De-

B

fence



fence of the received Doctrine and Practice, and not taking up any thing which might at the first sight seem contrary to it, but *being* sure of setting his Foot upon clear Grounds and solid Foundations. But in perusing the said Collection (altho' but in a cursory and often interrupted way, upon the account of other necessary Business) I do not find, that Mr. *W.* hath altogether used such Caution, but have observed many things in it defective, more superfluous, little or nothing at all to the purpose, and most of them wrong or misapply'd; so as to shew according to my Apprehension, a violent Propensity in the Collector, to lay hold of any thing, which favours, at least seemingly, his Tenents, and to slight, elude, or wrest strangely such things as seem quite to destroy his Opinions; and after all, I find him mighty bold in his Censures of, and giving very ill Names to, great Men, and even General Councils, which in Humility and Modesty we ought not to do, especially when speaking of dead Men, and People, which have been through so many Ages renown'd, and deservedly had in Honour, either for their Learning, or Piety, or for both; and when it is absolutely impossible to prove the contrary at so great a distance of time, and after the loss of so many ancient Monuments, in which the Actions of those Men and Councils were recorded. To set down all my Observations (which are many) in writing, is what my present Circumstances will by no means

means permit; and therefore I'll propose but some of them.

I. As for the Defects. Mr. *W.* in his Collection, especially in so large a one, should not have neglected those Passages of the N. Testament, in which such of the Old are alledged and illustrated, as being put together, make strong Proofs of the H. Trinity in general, or of the true Divinity of the Word and the H. Ghost in particular. I chuse to mention but one of this kind of Argument out of several others, because it seems to me not only to be of great force to prove the true Divinity and supreme Worship both of the Word and the H. Ghost, and the Mystery of the ever-blessed Trinity in the commonly received Sense; but will likewise be of great use in some following Animadversions upon Mr. *W.*'s Articles. The Argument is taken from \* *Isaiab*, Cap. vi. Which is very remarkable for this, that it hath been (as scarce any other Passage of the O. Testament hath been) quoted in all the Four Gospels, and in the *Acts of the Apostles*; as also alluded to

---

\* *Isaiab* vi. 1. — I saw the Lord sitting upon a Throne, high and lifted up, and his train filled the Temple. 2 And above it stood the Seraphims, each one had six wings—— 3 And one cried to another and said, Holy, holy, holy is the Lord of Hosts, the whole earth is full of his glory. 4 And the posts of the door moved at the voice of him that cried—— 8 Also I heard the voice of the Lord, saying, whom shall I send, and who will go for us. And then said I, here I am, send me. 9 And he said, go and tell this people, Hear ye indeed, but understand not; and see ye indeed, but perceive not. 10 Make the heart of this people fat, and make their ears heavy, and shut their eyes: lest they see with their eyes, and hear with their ears, and understand with their heart, and convert and be healed.

in the Epistle to the *Romans*, ch. xi. v. 8. and a Key to the sacred Mystery of the H. Trinity therein revealed, given by St. *John* and St. *Paul*. The Prophet *Isaiab* in the said Chapter relateth, how he saw in a Vision the Lord sitting upon a high Throne, v. 1. and the Seraphim standing about him, v. 2. and crying one to another, *Holy, holy, holy Lord of Hosts, the whole earth is full of his glory*, v. 3. And also how he heard the Voice of the Lord, saying, *Whom shall I send, and who will go for us?* (Mark here the Plural Number, which shall be explain'd by and by, out of the Writings of the N. Testament) and after the Prophet had answered, *Here am I, send me*, v. 8. how the Lord replied again and said: *Go and tell this People; hear ye indeed, but understand not; and see ye indeed, but perceive not*, &c. ver. 9. seqq. By which words it is certain, that God foretold the blindness of the *Jewish* Nation, and their Obstinacy in not receiving his sacred Truths; and it is *very probable*, that the Holy Ghost had a particular respect to the Mystery of the Holy Trinity, which was then shew'd to the Prophet, and more clearly afterwards to the holy Apostles; whereas the unbelieving *Jews*, and some of their Followers in this point, shut their Eyes against it, that seeing they do not see, and hearing they do not believe. But Catholick Christians do see, or may see with Reverence in this Vision of the Prophet, and firmly believe the sacred Mystery of the Unity in the Trinity, and the Trinity in the Unity of the Godhead. For it



is acknowledged by the *Jews*, and believed by Christians in general, that this *Holy, holy, holy Lord of Hosts* is the only true supreme God, called by St. *John* in a parallel place, *Rev. iv. 8.* Ἅγιος, ἅγιος, ἅγιος. Κύριος. ὁ Θεὸς ὁ παντοκράτωρ, *Holy, holy, holy, Lord God Almighty*: Which latter word especially, according to Mr. *W*'s own Observation, is a peculiar Epithet of the supreme God. Now if it can be demonstrated to any Christian, that this thrice named *Holy, holy, holy Lord of Hosts*, is the Father, the Son, and the Holy Ghost, he *must* consequently believe that these Three, the Father, the Son, and the Holy Ghost, are the one true God, the Lord of Hosts. Of the Father there can be now no Controversy, that he is this Holy Lord of Hosts, who appeared to the Prophet in a Vision. But that the Word of God, Christ our Redeemer, is likewise the Holy Lord of Hosts, whose Glory *Isaiab* did see, we are assured by St. *John* Chap. xii. of his Gospel, where after he had quoted *ver. 40.* the words of *Isaiab* Chap. vi. *ver. 10.* he adds *ver. 41.* an unusual Remark, which is not subjoined to any Quotation of the Old Testament in the New, (as if by a singular Inspiration, and to a singular Purpose, and therefore well to be consider'd), saying, Ταῦτα εἶπεν Ἡσαΐας, ὅτε εἶδε τὴν δόξαν αὐτοῦ, καὶ ἐλάλησε περὶ αὐτοῦ, *These things spake Esaias, when he saw his Glory, and spake of him*; namely, of Jesus our Saviour, whom he had just before mentioned, and who according to his divine Nature, had the Glory

2

of

of the Godhead *with the Father before the World was*, John xvii. 5. so that it well might be shewn to the Prophet. As for the Holy Ghost, St. Paul expressly ascribeth to him the words which the Lord that was seen by the Prophet, bid him speak to the People, in the abovementioned Chapter vi. ver. 10. of *Isaiab*. For thus the Apostle spoke to the Jews, Acts xxviii. 25, 26. Καλῶς τὸ πνεῦμα τὸ ἅγιον ἐλάλησέ διὰ Ἡσαΐου τοῦ Προφήτου πρὸς τοὺς πατέρας ὑμῶν, λέγον· πορεύεσθι πρὸς τὸν λαὸν τούτον καὶ εἰπέ· Ἀκοῇ ἀκούετε κ. τ. λ. *Well spake the Holy Ghost by Isaiab the Prophet unto our (or your) Fathers, saying, Go unto this People and say, Hearing ye shall hear and not understand, &c.* Therefore according to St. Paul's Mind, the Holy Ghost is likewise he who was seen and heard by *Esaias*, namely, the *Holy Lord of Hosts, whose Glory all the Earth is full of*; according to which supposition the Apocryphal Author of the Wisdom of Solomon saith, Chap. i. v. 7. Πνεῦμα Κυρίου ἐπλήρωσεν τὴν οἰκουμένην, *The Spirit of the Lord filleth the World.* Which I would not quote, if he did not in words agree with this Prophecy of *Isaiab*, and in Sense with *David*, Psal. cxxxix. 7. seqq. *Whither shall I go from thy Spirit, or whither shall I flee from thy Presence, &c.* Which by the by is as full and as lively an Expression of the divine Omnipresence as is ever given of, or by God the Father in holy Writ. Since then by the infallible Interpretation of the sacred Writers of the New Testament, the *Holy, holy, holy Lord of Hosts, whose Glory*  
*Isaias*

*Ifaias* saw, and whose Voice he heard, is not only the Father, but also the Son and the Holy Ghost, it must be certain to us Christians, that these Three, the Father, the Son, and the Holy Ghost are the one true God: And it is moreover highly probable, that even in respect of these Three Persons the *Holy, holy, holy*, was thrice repeated by the Seraphim, and set down by the Prophet, and that for this Reason the Lord said, in the plural Number, to the Prophet, as above mentioned: *Who will go for us? Seraphim quæ circa Deum sunt, quæ sola cognitione dicunt, Sanctus, sanctus, sanctus, propter hoc servant mysterium Trinitatis, quia & ipsa sunt sancta: The Seraphim which are about God, which say only by their own knowledge Holy, holy, holy, do therefore preserve the Mystery of the Trinity, because they also are holy,* faith thus far rightly Origen, *Hom. I. in Visiones Esaiæ.* Furthermore, as the *Holy, holy, holy Lord of Hosts*, the Father, the Son, and the Holy Ghost are the one true God, so were they equally worshipped by the Seraphim in one Song, and with the same Title of *Holy Lord of Hosts*. For this Vision was in the Temple, which is a Place of solemn Worship; and the Prophet mentions likewise a *θυσιαστήριον* or *Altar*, (as we call it) from which the Angel took the Coal, and which implies the highest degree of Worship, viz. a Sacrifice or an Oblation of Incense, as *St. John* saw, *Rev. viii. 3.* given to the Angel, *that he should offer it with the Prayers of all Saints upon the Golden Altar, which was before*  
the



*the Throne of God.* And indeed *St. John* in the parallel place, *Rev. iv.* mentioning *ver. 8.* the crying of ἅγιος, ἅγιος, ἅγιος, κ. τ. λ. *Holy, holy, holy, &c.* interpreteth the same *ver. 9.* by giving δόξαν καὶ τιμὴν καὶ εὐχαρίστησιν τῷ καθήμενῳ ἐπὶ θρόνῳ, *Glory, and Honour, and Thanks to him that sitteth upon the Throne.* Now I think this Argument for the Holy Trinity of the Father, Son, and Holy Ghost, in the Unity of the divine Essence, and for their joint Worship so strong and so plain, that *Mr. W.* should not have neglected the aforementioned places of Scripture; especially since so many much less to the purpose, are set down by him: And I do not see what he in opposition to it, can answer to God or Man for his disbelief of the true Godhead of the Word and the Holy Ghost, and for his denying to them the same Worship as is paid to the Father; of which something more shall be said in a Remark upon his second Article.

§. 2. Having given an Instance of *Mr. W.*'s defect in the Allegation of the Holy Scriptures, I will next mention an omission as to the Testimonies of the Fathers. And first of *Clemens Alexandrinus*, which I place before others, because *Mr. W.* in the very beginning of his Collection, *Page 1.* endeavours to make an Apology for this omission, but such a one as consists altogether of plainly false or ambiguous Propositions. *St. Clemens* Presbyter of *Alexandria*, was a famous Writer about the end of the second Century, whose Books are very much and very deservedly esteem'd, as for other reasons,

so for this, because he had received his Doctrine from, and was instructed by several Disciples of the very chief of the Apostles, Οἱ μὲν ἡ ἀληθῆς καὶ μακαρίας σωζόντες διδασκαλίας ἀφ' ἧς ἀπὸ Πέτρου τε καὶ Ἰακώβου Ἰωάννου τε καὶ Παύλου τῶν ἁγίων Ἀποστόλων κ. τ. λ. *Who had truly preserved the Tradition of the blessed Doctrine as coming directly from the holy Apostles Peter, and James, and John, and Paul, &c. Lib. I. Strom. pag. 274.* Upon which account he should not have been neglected by Mr. *W.* But he hath so plainly written of the Consubstantiality or Equality, and Coeternity of the Son with the Father, that Mr. *W.* chargeth him *pag. 1.* with *extravagant*, and *pag. 103.* with *unusual* Expressions, (for so they seem'd to him) and addeth in the latter place very confidently, but falsely, and more than he ever will be able to prove, that *they were not relished or entertain'd by the Church in those days.* This I take to be the true reason of leaving *St. Clemens* quite out of the Collection. However what reason pretendeth Mr. *W.* for it? *Excluding*, saith he, *Clemens Alexandrinus and Tertullian, because of their being much later than almost all here alledged.* I answer, *Clemens Alexandrinus* was not much later than most of the other Writers of the second Century, alledged in the Collection, either compared with them, or in respect of those of the first Century: And certainly he was much elder than the *Pseudo-Clemens*, whose strangely interpolated Constitutions and Recognitions Mr. *W.* reciteth over and over, and relieth very

C

much

much upon them. And why should he then not have quoted the former as well, or much rather than the latter? Why? because these, as shall in due time be proved by an ocular Demonstration, are interpolated by Hereticks such as had the same Hypothesis with Mr. *W.* and consequently they served his turn. But, saith Mr. *W.* farther, *We have none but the more Juvenile and Philosophical Works of Clemens.* And presently after he calleth particularly his *Protrepticus* and *Pædagogus* absolutely *Juvenile Works.* *Juvenile?* Supposing them so to be, what then? Could not a young Man, especially of that Capacity, as St. *Clemens* was, set down the Tenents and Traditions of his Apostolical Preceptors, as was his Custom and Design to do (see the forequoted *pag. 274. Lib. i. Strom.*) for which purpose there is not so much Judgment required, as Memory and Faithfulness. However Mr. *W.*'s Assertion of St. *Clemens*, *Protrepticus* and *Pædagogus* being his *Juvenile* Writings, and that we have none but his *more Juvenile and Philosophical Works*, is either very ambiguous or downright false and precarious. We have 1. His *Protrepticus ad Gentes.* 2. His *Pædagogus*; and then 3. His *Stromata.* These were written in the same order as here enumerated, and as placed in the Edition of his Works, which (appeareth from the beginning of the *Pædagogus*, and from *Lib. vi. Strom. p. 616, 617. Lib. VII. p. 711, &c.*) and indeed they did follow soon one after another, as is insinuated in the same places. Now that the



*Stromata* were composed by St. Clemens a long while after he had heard his Teachers, and consequently not in his *Juvenile Age*, is plain from *Lib. I. Strom. p. 276.* (not to mention other Places and Arguments) where he, speaking of the Doctrines of his Preceptors, saith, Πολλὰ ὃ εὖ οἶδα, παρερρήνηκεν ἡμᾶς, χρόνῳ μῆκει [N. B.] διαπεσόντα, I am very sensible, that many things through length of time, are slipt out of my mind, complaining also of the ἀδυνεὶς τῆ μνήμης, weakness of his Memory. And again, Ἐστὶ μὲν ἐν τιναῖς μὲν ἀπομνημονεύθεντα ἡμῖν — ἔστι δὲ καὶ ἀνυποσημειώτα μεμνηνότα τῷ χρόνῳ, ἀ νῦν ἀπέδρα, κ. τ. λ. Some things I cannot remember,— and some I have taken no notes of, which by that means might have remained for a long time, but now are past recovery, &c. And that he had written other Books before his *Stromata* and *Pædagogus*, appeareth from *Lib. II. Pædag. c. 10. p. 193. c.* where he alledgeth his Book of Continence, περὶ ἡσυχασίας; and from *Lib. III. Pædag. c. 8. p. 237.* where he refers to his Treatise concerning Marriage, and saith that he hath explained there, *How the Wife ought to live with her Husband, and govern the House, and how to use her Servants, and what is her own proper Business, as likewise of the proper time for Marriage, and whatever relates to Wives. Quomodo oporteat quidem Uxorem simul cum Marito vivere, & de Domûs administratione, & usu Famulorum, & quæ ab ea seorsim fieri oporteat, & de tempore Matrimonii, & de iis quæ mulieribus conveniunt,*

of which things he could not write very young neither. Nor do I see a sufficient Reason for which Mr. *W.* calls the extant Works of *St. Clemens*, *Philosophical*; which rather ought to be named *Theological*, there being in them more Divinity, and Testimonies of Scripture, and Ecclesiastical Writers, than Philosophy, and Quotations of the Philosophers; altho' he brings the latter often in, to shew their Agreement in many Theological Propositions with the former. But Mr. *W.* goes on in these words; *We want the more authentick and judicious work, the Hypotyposis, containing ancients Doctrines and Traditions deliver'd to him by his old and famous Master Pantænus, from the Companions of the Apostles.* Here again I do not apprehend any Reason, why Mr. *W.* should call the almost lost Hypotyposes of *St. Clemens*, in comparison of his extant Books, *the more authentick Work, containing ancients Doctrines and Traditions*; whereas *Clemens* a little after the beginning of the *Stromata*, p. 274. expressly testifieth, that he design'd to make this Work a Treasury, and a lively Representation of ἐναργῶν καὶ ἐμψύχων κηένων, ὧν κατεξιώθη ἐπακῶσαι λόγων τε καὶ ἀνδρῶν μακαρίων, καὶ τῶ ὄντι ἀξιολόγων; *those clear and lively Sayings, and those holy and truly valuable Men, he had the happiness to hear.* Nor did he put down only what he had heard from *Pantæmus*, but from several other Disciples of the Apostles, of whom he there mentions many more; one of *Ionia*, others of *Great Græcia*,  
one

one of *Cœlesyria*, another of *Egypt*, &c. † I should therefore think in this respect the *Stromata* as authentick and valuable as the *Hypotyposes*: And indeed upon another account I would prefer them, as also the other somewhat earlier Books of *St. Clemens*, which are preserved; his *Paedagogus* and *Protrepticus*, (for even in them || we may observe, altho' not so often, some ancient Traditions or Expositions of Scripture) before the said *Hypotyposes*; namely, because the ἀδυνεὺς, the *Weakness* of his Memory, of which he complains, increased daily according to the course of Nature: And therefore he tells us in the afore-quoted pag. 274. *Lib. I. Strom.* that he wrote this Work as a φάρμακον λήθης, a *Remedy for his Forgetfulness*, being desirous to transmit the Doctrines which he had received from his great Masters, uncorrupted to Posterity, τὴν μαχέραν παρέδωκεν ἀδιάδεσσαν φυλάσσειν, as the Phrase is, p. 275. And to be sure he did, the longer he lived, the less remember, not only the Propositions which he had heard from his Apostolical Ancestors, but also the Words, and the manner wherein they were delivered; upon which, yet the true Sense very often and very much depends. And as for *Clemens* his Judgment, the *Hypotyposes* could

---

† And indeed not only the several Quotations of the *Apocryphal* Scriptures written by the first Disciples of the Apostles, but the frequent recital of the words of *S. Barnabas*, *Hermas*, *Clemens Romanus*, some times without naming them, throughout almost the whole Work of *Stromata*, confirmeth very much the Truth of what hath been said of it.

|| Compare *L. II. Paedag. c. 10. p. 188.* with *Barnab. Ep. c. 10.*  
not



not be much more judicious, since they were written not long after his other Works, nay immediately after the *Stromata*, infomuch that they might in a manner be reckoned one continued Work, as shall be proved, God willing, in my next Volume of *Spicilegium Patrum*; where likewise from the many, and pretty large Fragments, I intend to shew the Contents of each of the Eight Books of those *Hypotyposes* so highly magnified by Mr. *W.* The Reason indeed why he doth so, is evident enough, and intimated by himself in these following words: *Which (Hypotyposes) we know explained or contradicted the Extravagancies of his former Expressions in these matters, (namely concerning the true Divinity of the Λόγος) and agreed with the more ancient Doctrines.* And in the Margin Mr. *W.* refers to *Photius* his *Myriobiblon*, *Cod. 109. p. 285.* Now it is true indeed, that *Photius* speaking of this Work of *Clemens*, saith, ὅτι υἱὸν εἰς κτίσμα κατέργει, *he debased the Son into a Creature.* But then he alledgeth from the same, several other strange Doctrines, *v. 9.* that Matter was eternal, and many other absurd Tenents, most of which it is impossible to ascribe to *St. Clemens*, unless we would suppose him to be turned a most wild Heretick. My Lord Bp. *Bull* *Defens. Fid. Nic. Lib. II. c. 6. §. 9.* refuting *Sandius* (who likewise boasted of those *Hypotyposes*) hath recited all those Absurdities mentioned by *Photius*, except the Hypothesis of several ancient Hereticks, that the Son was not truly incarnate, but only in appearance; and  
hath

hath shew'd from *Photius* his own words, his Suspicion and Reason that those absurd Tenents were foisted into the said *Hypotypeses*; of which Mr. *W.* takes no notice at all. And indeed such Interpolation of the many Heretical Propositions must be supposed, if no other Answer could be given. For as *Ruffinus de Adulteratione Librorum Origenis*, concerning the Adulteration of the Books of Origen, speaking of St. Clemens, well objects: *Nunquid credibile est de tanto viro tam in omnibus Catholico, tam erudito, ut vel sibi contraria senserit, vel ea quæ de Deo, non dicam credere, sed vel audire quidem impium est, scripta reliquerit?* Can it be imagined of so great a Man, so orthodox in all respects, and so learned, that he should entertain contrary Opinions, or should leave behind him in his Writings, such Doctrines concerning God, as it were impious, I will not say to believe, but so much as to hearken to? But St. Clemens may yet by another more true way, as I think, be vindicated from the foul Aspersions of so many absurd Doctrines, without the aforesaid supposition of these *Hypotypeses* being corrupted by Hereticks. For as *Photius* truly tells us, in those Books, was contain'd an Exposition of *Genesis*, *Exodus*, the *Psalms*, the *Apostolical Epistles*, &c. Now Clemens himself, *Lib. IV. Strom. p. 475.* where he speaks of his design of writing those *Hypotypeses*, (as I prove in my *Spicilegium*) and tells us that he would begin with his Comment upon *Genesis*, adds also expressly, that he would put down there partly the sense of the Hereticks:

ticks : ἢ ἀρχὴν τῆς παραδόσεως ἀπὸ τῆς προφητείας ποιησόμεθα. ἡμεῖς, ἐν μέρει καὶ τὰ τῆς ἐπεροδόξων παραπθέμενοι, Taking the rise of what he should deliver from the divinely inspired Book of Genesis, but adding withal the particular Opinions of the heterodox Teachers. The like Method he seems to have observed in the Exposition of the other Scriptures, as may partly be inferr'd from a large Fragment of his Comment upon the 19<sup>th</sup> Psalm, where he alledgeth not only *Pantæus* his Exposition, but also *Hermogenes* his Heretical Sense, of which more in the *Spicilegium*. St. *Clement* indeed after the words just now quoted, immediately subjoins ; Καὶ ὡς οἶόντε ἡμῖν διαλύεσθαι περὶ ὧν αὐτοὶ, giving moreover such answers to them as we shall be able ; testifying thereby, that he would attempt to refute those heterodox Expositions. But whether he hath done so or not, *Photius*, who read, or rather run over so many Volumes, may not have so carefully distinguished what *Clemens* spoke according to his own or his Apostolical Ancestor's Mind, from the Heretical Tenents there brought in, or those from their Refutations subjoined ; which according to St. *Clemens* his way of writing, is not so easie a matter. And indeed whosoever will peruse but a little his *Stromata*, shall find it often very difficult to discern St. *Clemens*'s words from those whom he quoteth, sometimes with, and sometimes without a Name. Wherefore it is highly probable, that the above-mentioned Heterodox Principles in the *Hypotyposes*, and among the rest such as made Christ a Creature, had been according



according to his Method taken from the Writings of the Hereticks, and were not St. *Clemens* his own Assertions; since they are so contrary to what he has taught in his other Books, as in other Articles, so in this of the Divinity of the  $\Lambda\omicron\varsigma\Theta$  and the Holy Trinity. For *in omnibus pene Libris suis Trinitatis gloriam atque eternitatem unam eandemque designat*: In all his Books he maintains one and the same Glory and Eternity of the Three Persons of the Godhead, as *Rufinus* rightly observes *loco citato*, and as in great measure appears from the places which my Lord Bishop *Bull* in the abovementioned 6. c. hath recited, and I have added in my Annotation, not only from his *Protrepticus* and *Paedagogus*, but also from his *Stromata*, he speaking in the latter no less plain and full of the Co-essentiality of the \*  $\Lambda\omicron\varsigma\Theta$  than in the former, although Mr. *W.* intimates the contrary shortly after what hath been hitherto refuted at large. And this I have done, not only to shew the vanity of his Apology for omitting the Testimonies of St. *Clemens*, but also that the Reader from the very beginning of his Treatise, may have a Caution (which I hear that Mr. *W.* often inculcateth to others against Bishop *Bull*'s

---

\* And as for the Holy Ghost, I have likewise a pretty Fragment of one of St. *Clement*'s lost Books; wherein he absolutely calleth the Holy Spirit *Θεὸν*, which shall be produced in due time, if no where else, yet in my *Spicilegium*: Whereby, as well as from other places, partly quoted by Mr. *W.* himself, may plainly be proved the falsity of his bold Assertion, pag. 89. That the Holy Ghost was not directly called God, to be sure, till the latter part of the Fourth Century.

and the like Writings) namely, not to take his Articles and several Assertions with which his Collection is interwoven, barely upon his own Authority, since so many groundless or utterly false Propositions are heaped together in few Lines of the first Page.

§. 3. Now I could likewise make several Remarks upon his pretences for leaving out *Tertullian*, and upon what he hath said of him, as well as other Writers of the Third Century, in the entrance of this Collection (though he now and then quotes him and them, when they seem to favour him) but I will only endeavour to take off that which I think to be the true, tho' not a just reason of their being omitted, and of Mr. *W*'s prejudice against them; namely, because they almost all have written more plainly against the most and chiefest Articles of Mr. *W*. than the foregoing Fathers, it was not fit that they should be quoted as Witnesses for him; and because they have done so, he thinks them to be Innovators and Corrupters of the ancient Christian Doctrine. Now they might justly be so reckoned, if they had written contrary to what the Fathers of the First and Second Centuries have deliver'd in their Books. But if about the Co-essentiality of the Holy Trinity, or in any other Articles, the later Fathers have not contradicted the former, but only taught in more explicit and plainer Terms than they, it is not reasonable they should be slighted or blamed for it, since they have done nothing else but what was very natural and even laudable

dable in them to do. For it is confirm'd by the Experience of all Ages, that not only Christian, but any other Writers of good Sense have in process of time, more clearly and accurately written of their Tenents and Doctrines, especially if they have met with any opposers, to whom they must have a regard. And indeed this may be observed in the very Writings of the Apostles, and in this very Article of the Divinity of Christ, since *St. Matthew*, *Mark* and *Luke* have not so expressly written about it, as *St. John* has done in opposition to *Ebion* and *Cerintbus*, who denied the same; yea the two former have not so much as once given to Christ the Name of *Λόγος*, which so frequently occurs in the Writings of *St. John*. But who would therefore think, that this beloved Disciple in the end of the First Century, hath innovated or added to the Doctrines of the other Apostles? And who would not rather gladly accept of this more clear Expression of the Divinity of the *Λόγος* or the Son of God? And so should likewise *Mr. W.* with approbation, receive the more plain Propositions of *Tertullian* and other Fathers of the Third Century, concerning the Co-essentiality of the *Λόγος* and of the Holy Trinity in general, till he can demonstrate that they have not explained, but contradicted the Doctrine of their Ancestors. But I will not enlarge farther upon this Subject, and will but in a few words mention another grand Defect of *Mr. W's* Collection; which is, That he hath not given answers to



most of those Testimonies which Bishop Bull in his *Defens. Fid. Nic.* and I have alledged, nor made Exceptions against the Answers to such places as he hath brought in favour of the *Arian* Doctrine: which he should have done, since it is in general highly reasonable, and a Duty incumbent upon any one who thinks fit to oppose the received Doctrine of the Church, to shew that what hath been written in defence of it on purpose, is groundless or false. And Mr. *W.* to excuse this omission, can hardly make use of the common pretence of *studium brevitatis*, because he hath made a pretty large business of the matter, and hath exceeded in several things, as I shall now shew briefly in some instances.

§ 4. First, Mr. *W.* hath, according to my apprehension, too much multiplied his Articles, when, to make the business easy to his Superiors, and indeed to any who would undertake to set him right, he should have confin'd himself to the two main Points controverted between the Catholics and the *Arians*; namely, the *ὁμοούσιον* and the *συυαΐδιον* of the Son, and also of the Holy Ghost, altho' he might perhaps have well added the Article, concerning the reasonable Soul of Christ. However since he hath thought fit to make more Articles, he should then, Secondly, have brought no other Testimonies but what are directly to the purpose, and what are true and genuine; whereas he hath in several Articles set down many, which are very far from proving his Propositions, and are not Illu-  
strations

strations neither, but are rather apt to confound  
 and tire the Reader, and he hath recited at  
 large others which are false and spurious. As  
 for instance; To prove that there is but one  
 true God, namely the Father excluding the  
 Word and the Holy Ghost, which is the design  
 of the First Article, eleven Pages, and those  
 closely written are filled with a multitude of  
 places of Scripture, where *our Father*, or *our*  
*Father in Heaven*, and the like, is barely na-  
 med; from which I do not see how Mr. *W.*  
 will draw his Conclusion, and prove his Point.  
 And as for the Fathers, to confirm the said First  
 Article, he hath filled almost a whole Page,  
 namely, 6<sup>th</sup> and *seq.* with many places taken  
 out of the eight Books of the *Clementine* Con-  
 stitutions; which make likewise a great part of  
 his Collection in several other Articles, and up-  
 on which he lays great stress. Now these Te-  
 stimonies are to be looked upon as false and  
 spurious, till Mr. *W.* will be able (which he  
 never will be) to prove against the common  
 Sentiments of Protestant and Popish Writers  
 now living, that these eight Books are a genu-  
 ine and not interpolated Work of St. *Clemens*  
 the Disciple of the Apostles. On the contrary,  
 as I have in my *Spicilegium Patrum*, Tom. I.  
 p. 284. *seq.* affirmed, and partly proved, so I  
 shall, God willing, in due time, more clearly  
 and fully shew, that these eight Books of Apo-  
 stolical Constitutions are a Collection of the  
*Didascalia* of the Apostles, of *Clemens Roma-*  
*mus*, *Hippolytus*, and of the like ancient Wri-  
 tings

tings put together, but strangely interpolated and viciated by an *Arian*; in so much that he hath not scrupled to add whole Chapters, and to turn Affirmatives into Negatives, & *vice versa*. And therefore all the Testimonies which in that, and from thence in Mr. *W*'s Collection, favour *Arianism*, may in general justly be supposed to be spurious and foisted in by the said Compiler, though that could not be proved of any one of them in particular. However even that may be done now and then, namely where we have by the good Providence of God, preserved the first pieces without the Interpolations. As for instance, \* What Mr. *W*. quotes p. 84. to prove his XIX<sup>th</sup> Article, from *Lib. 8. Constit. cap. 37.* where God the Father is called *ὁ ὡς ἑνὸς ἡμεῖς Κύριος* the Lord of the Holy Spirit, is in neither of the two Manuscripts of the Bodlejan Library at Oxford, mention'd in my *Spicilegium*, p. 286. from both which it appears that seven Chapters, namely from the 35<sup>th</sup> to the 42<sup>d</sup> have been inserted by the Collector. And I think it of no better or surer Authority, what Mr. *W*. in the following p. 85. quoteth from the Recognitions of the *Pseudo-Clemens*, *Lib. III. cap. 11.* where the Holy Ghost is said to be *factus per factum*, made by him that was likewise made, meaning the Son; since it is certain, that either St. *Clemens* of Rome himself has not written these Recognitions, or if he has, that they are likewise strangely inter-

---

\* Account of the Primitive Faith, p. 344.



polated, as *Rufinus*, who translated them has observed in his Preface, and *Epiphanius*, *Hæres.* xxx. §. 15. naming in particular the *Ebionites*, as I have mentioned in my *Spicilegium*, which *Mr. W.* has not been pleased to take any notice of, (tho' he quotes the same otherwise very often) because it ruin'd the Authority of his chiefest Testimony, for making the Holy Ghost to be made by the Son. I could likewise say something of some other spurious Testimonies, or much more recent than the Second Century, if time would permit me. But enough of the second sort of Remarks.

§. 5. I hasten to my third Particular, which is to give some Instances of *Mr. W.*'s misapplying or misinterpreting divers Testimonies alledged for his purpose, and of some Assertions which I think to be quite wrong and false. As for Article I. some places of Scripture are there applied to, and interpreted of God the Father, which belong to the Son of God; of which sort I will only mention two Quotations out of *St. Paul's* Epistles\*: The first, *Rom.* ix. 5. 'Ο ὢν ἐπὶ πάντων θεὸς εὐλογητὸς εἰς τὰς αἰῶνας, *Who is over all, God blessed for ever*, which never any ancient Christian Interpreter, or Expositor, or any other Writer, did otherwise understand but of Christ; and not only Catholics, but even Hereticks (although they did abuse this Epithet given to our Saviour) and Schismatics; and among these in the

---

\* Account, p. 13.

Third Century, Mr. *W*'s beloved *Novatian* himself, *Lib. de Trinitate, cap. 13. & 30.* And no wonder, since the Text of St. *Paul* doth not at all hang together, if the words 'Ο ὅτι πάντων Θεός, *God over all*, are applied to God the Father. For tho' the Apostle now and then inserts in the middle of his Periods, a Doxology to the Father, yet he never doth it, but where the same is mentioned immediately before; and then he refers to him, and makes a plain connexion by the Relative ὅς or ὁ, viz. *Rom. i. 25.* Παρά τ' κτίσαντα, ὅς ἔστιν εὐλογητός εἰς τὰς αἰῶνας, *More than the Creator, who is blessed for ever.* And *2 Cor. xi. 31.* 'Ο Θεός καὶ πατήρ τ' Κυρίου ἡμῶν Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ, οἶδεν ὁ ὢν εὐλογητός εἰς τὰς αἰῶνας, *The God and Father of our Lord Jesus Christ, which is blessed for evermore, &c.* And exactly in the same manner doth he in the other place, *Rom. ix. 5.* by the same ὁ ὢν *who is*, refer to Christ immediately before named, without any mention of God the Father. Another reason for expounding the words ὁ ὢν ὅτι πάντων Θεός, *who is God over all*, of the Divine Nature of Christ; I have in my Annotations upon Bp. *Bull's Defens. Fid. Nic. §. 2. cap. 3. Parag. 3.* taken from the Restriction τὸ κατὰ σάρκα added to Χριστός, *as concerning the flesh of Christ*, in the same Period, which I will not here repeat. But against the universal Consent, and the very Coherence of the Text it self, Mr. *W.* opposeth some false Reasonings, or such as beg the Question, or both. (1.) Saith Mr. *W.* *All St. Paul's Doxologies elsewhere seem to me to belong*

*belong only to the Father.* But to me it seems, that one, namely, *Rom. xi. 36.* belongs to the Father, Son, and Holy Ghost, Ἐξ αὐτοῦ, καὶ δι' αὐτοῦ, καὶ εἰς αὐτὸν πάντα· αὐτῷ ἡ δόξα εἰς τοὺς αἰῶνας· ἀμὲν; *Of him, and through him, and to him are all things; to him be glory for ever, Amen.* And that another is plainly given to our Saviour, *2 Tim. iv. 18.* Πύσειαί με ὁ Κύριος ἀπὸ παντὸς ἔργου πονηροῦ, καὶ σώσει εἰς τὴν βασιλείαν αὐτοῦ τὴν ἐπουράνιον· ᾧ ἡ δόξα εἰς τοὺς αἰῶνας τῶν αἰώνων. Ἀμήν. *The Lord shall deliver me from every evil work, and preserve me unto his heavenly kingdom, to whom be glory for ever and ever. Amen.* For Κύριος, Lord, signifieth generally in *St. Paul's Epistles*, not God the Father, but our Saviour, as in this very *Chap. v. 1, 8, &c.* And in the Conclusion of it, Κύριος Ἰησοῦς Χριστὸς μετὰ τοῦ πνεύματος σου, *The Lord Jesus Christ be with thy spirit.* (2.) *Mr. W.* goes on thus: *If this be a proper Doxology, as the Amen seems to imply, it cannot belong to any but the Father.* This is indeed *petitio* τῇ ἐν ἀρχῇ, *begging the question, why not to any but the Father?* For *St. Peter* concludes his second Epistle with a proper Doxology to Jesus Christ, and this with *Amen*, as *Mr. W.* himself granteth in his *Collection of the Primitive Doxologies*; saying, that it is directed expressly and only to Jesus Christ himself; and that likewise out of the six Doxologies which are in *St. John's Revelation*, Two belong to the Father and Son jointly, and one to the Son alone. (3.) *Mr. W.* argueth thus, *The Priphra-* *sis ὁ ἐνὶ πάντων Θεός, God over all, both in Scrip-*  

E
ture,



ture, in the Apostolical Constitutions, in Irenæus, and in Origen, directly and singly means God the Father, and 'twas then thought that to say the Son was *ὁ ἐπὶ πάντων Θεός*, was little less than Ignorance, Heresy, or Blasphemy, as we shall see presently. But if it was so, why have both these Fathers named by Mr. W. understood the words of the Apostle, *ὁ ἐπὶ πάντων Θεός*, of Christ, namely Irenæus, Lib. III. c. 18. And Origen in his Comment upon the place, and elsewhere. It was indeed absurd, and even blasphemous to name Christ, *τὸ ἐπὶ πάντων Θεόν*, God over all, in the same sense in which the Hereticks did, of whom some made the Son the same Person with the Father and the H. Ghost, (of which the interpolated Constitutions speak) others would in no respect allow Christ to be inferior to God the Father, yea even fancied him to be above the Creator of the World. But what is that to St. Paul, and to the Catholick Christians, who call him so in another sense? As for what Mr. W. says, that *ὁ ἐπὶ πάντων Θεός*, God over all, in Scripture denotes singly the Father, I remember but one place more where this Epithet is used, *Ephes. iv. 6*. And how he can infer from thence, that it singly belongeth to the Father, I do not apprehend. What (4.) Mr. W. objects, that the Epithet *εὐλογητός* blessed, is in Scripture always appropriated to the Father, is either false, or of no force, since Christ is called *εὐλογητός*, *Pf. cxviii. 26. Mat. xxi. 9. xxiii. 39. Mark xi. 9. Luke xix. 38.* which is much the same with *εὐλογητός*, tho' even

even some Copies, *Mat. xxi. 9.* have *εὐλογητός*. Mr. *W.*'s 5<sup>th</sup> Reason differs but in words from the second, and is answer'd. As for the 6<sup>th</sup>, where he saith, That *the language is very natural in his sense*, &c. I have proved the contrary already; and Mr. *W.* will not be able to shew one single place in the Apostle's Writings, where he has broke out (as Mr. *W.* supposes him here to have done) on a sudden, without any connexion with the foregoing and following words: (*God be blessed for ever.*)

§. 6. The other place of St. Paul, which Mr. *W.* misapplies to God the Father, is *Tit. ii. 13.* where the Apostle mentions, *Μακαρίαν ἐλπίδα καὶ ὑπαφάνειαν τῆς δόξης τοῦ μεγάλου Θεοῦ καὶ σωτῆρος ἡμῶν Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ*. *the blessed hope, and glorious appearing of the great God and our Saviour Jesus Christ*; whereas I and others take the Title *μεγάλου Θεοῦ* together with *καὶ σωτῆρος*, to be said of Jesus Christ, because the Apostle doth not put the Article *τοῦ* before *σωτῆρος*, to distinguish him from the beforementioned *τοῦ μεγάλου Θεοῦ*, and because the *ὑπαφάνεια*, *appearing*, is always in St. Paul's Writings, and in all other Scriptures of the N. Testament, ascribed to the Son alone, and never to the Father; tho' once our Saviour hath said *Matth. xvi. &c.* his *ὑπαφάνεια* or coming, shall be *in the Father's and in his own Glory*; to which Saying therefore Mr. *W.* doth refer in the Quotation of this Apostolical Place, not considering accurately the difference now mentioned. But more do I wonder that he refers to *Apocalyp. xix. 17.* where is mentio-

ned τὸ δεῖπνον μεγάλης θεῷ. *The Supper of the great God*, understanding likewise God the Father, whereas to prove, that here the μέγας θεός, *great God*, is again God the Son, I refer him to the foregoing v. 9. where St. John calls it τὸ δεῖπνον τῆ γάμου τοῦ ἀρνίου, *the Marriage-supper of the Lamb*.

§. 8. As for the rest of the places of Scripture, in which God the Father is really spoken of, Mr. W. can chiefly urge such, in which he is called μόνος ἀληθινός θεός, *the only true God*, John xvii. 3. μόνος σοφός θεός, *the only wise God*, Rom. xvi. 27. and Jud. ver. 25. and the like, 1 Tim. vi. 15, 16. As also εἰς θεός, *one God*, 1 Cor. viii. 4, 5. Ephes. iv. 6, &c. To which both Ancient and Modern Divines have answer'd again and again, That those Additions μόνος & εἰς, *only and one*, are oppos'd to the false Gods of the Heathen, τοῖς μὴ φύσει εἶσι θεοῖς, *those which by nature are no Gods*, Galat. iv. 8. And that thereby are excluded all the λεγόμενοι θεοί, εἴτε ἐν οὐρανῷ, εἴτε ἐπὶ τῆς γῆς. *that are called Gods, whether in heaven, or in earth*, as the Apostle himself in one of the places quoted by Mr. W. namely, 1 Cor. viii. doth plainly intimate; but not that the Son and H. Ghost are thereby separated from the Father, and denied to be together with him one true God; since the Name, the Attributes, the Works, the Glory and Worship belonging alone to the Godhead, is ascribed to them in other places of Scripture. And indeed St. Jude, ver. 4. of his Epistle, doth call Christ, ὁ μόνον δεσπότω θεόν καὶ Κύριον ἡμῶν Ἰησοῦν Χριστόν.



*κύριον · the only Lord God, and our Lord Jesus Christ.* For that *δεσπότης θεός* as well as *κύριος*, belongeth to our Saviour, is plain from the parallel place of *St. Peter*, which *St. Jude* hath almost transcribed, *2 Ep. ii. 1. τὴν ἀγοράσαντα αὐτὸς δεσπότην ἀρνέμεται, denying the Lord that bought them.* But who would therefore exclude the Father from being *δεσπότης θεός καὶ κύριος ἡμεῶν, the Lord God, and our Lord?* As for what is excepted, that the Father is called *μόνος ἀληθινός θεός*, and *εἷς θεός, the only true God, and one God*, in such places where Christ is named immediately after, and that therefore he, as well as other *λεγόμενοι θεοί, called Gods*, is excluded. To this I reply again, (1.) That *μόνος only*, added to a Person doth not always exclude another immediately after mentioned, if both are of the same kind, but rather includeth the same; as when *St. Paul* writes *1 Cor. ix. 6. Ἡ μόνος ἐγὼ καὶ Βαρνάβας οὐκ ἔχοντες ἐξουσίαν ἢ μὴ ἐργάζεσθαι, or I only and Barnabas, have not we power to forbear working?* Yea this may appear from the very passages quoted by *Mr. W. 1 Cor. viii. and Ephes. iv.* For if by *εἷς θεός one God*, there our Saviour be excluded, then by *εἷς κύριος one Lord*, God the Father is excluded, since both are mentioned together. (2.) Supposing that our Saviour were excluded by *μόνος only*, in the said places, especially *John xvii.* then he might be excluded as he was a Man, *Jesus Christ*, who was sent, and who then pray'd to his Father and to his God: But it doth not necessarily follow, that he was not one God with the

the Father according to his superior Nature ; in respect of which, towards the end of this Chapter he saith, *ver. 22. ἡμεῖς ἐν ἑσμῷ, we are one.* And again, *chap. x. ver. 30. Ἐγὼ καὶ πατήρ ἐν ἑσμῷ, I and the Father are one ;* not only in Will, but also in the Power of the Godhead ; because he supposeth there his and his Father's Hand, that is, his divine Power and Might to be the same ; and that this supposition might not be thought strange, he adds, *I and the Father are one.* It doth not only appear that there is no necessity of excluding the Son by the word *μόνῳ* only, in the aforesaid places ; but in one of them it is plain that he must not be excluded, *viz. 1 Tim. vi. 15.* where God is called *ὁ μακάριος καὶ μόνος δυνάστης, ὁ βασιλεὺς καὶ βασιλεύωντων καὶ Κύριος καὶ Κυριεύωντων, the blessed and only Potentate, King of Kings, and Lord of Lords,* for this very Name is given and ascribed to our Saviour, *Rev. xvii. 14. and xix. 16.* But enough of the Scriptures quoted in the First Article.



**FINIS.**

Some BOOKS lately printed and sold by Henry Clements at the Half-Moon in St. Paul's Church-yard.

**A**N Essay upon two Arabick Manuscripts of the Bodleian Library, and that ancient Book, call'd, *The Doctrine of the Apostles*, which is said to be extant in them: wherein Mr. Whiston's Mistakes about both are plainly prov'd. The Second Edition.

*Dissertatio de variis Vitiis LXX. interpretum Versioni ante B. Origenis ævum illatis, & Remediis ab ipso in Hexaplati ejusdem versionis Editione adhibitis, deque hujus Editionis Reliquiis tam manuscriptis quam prælo excusis.*

*Septuaginta Interpretum Tomus ultimus continet Psalmorum, Jobi, ac tres Solomonis libros, cum Apocrypha ejusdem, nec non Siracide Sapientia. Quos ex Alexandrino Codice descriptos, & ope aliorum Exemplarium, ac priscorum Scriptorum, Præsertim vero Hexaplati Editionis Origenianæ, Emendatos atque suppletos, additis sapissime Asteris eorum & Obelorum signis.*

These Three by John Ernest Grabe D. D.

*Orationes duæ in Theatro Sheldoniæ vi. Kal. Maii MDCCVI. (Quo die Academiae Francofurtanæ Encœnia Sæcularia ibidem celebrata sunt) Habita, à Rev. Viro Georgio Smalridge, D. D. Altera, cum Clariss. Virum Joh. Ernest Grabe, Borossium, ad Doctoratum in S. Theol. Universitati Oxoniensi commendaret; Altera, cum eundem Insignibus Academicis ornaret.*

An Essay against Arianism and some other Heresies, Or, a Reply to Mr. William Whiston's Historical Preface and Appendix to his Primitive Christianity reviv'd.

The Present Case of Mr. William Whiston, Humbly represented in a Letter to the Reverend the Clergy now assembled in Convocation.

Mr. William Whiston's Case represented to the Honourable the House of Commons: In a Letter to the Honourable the Members for both Universities in this present Parliament.

The English Grammar: Or, an Essay on the Art of Grammar, applied to and exemplified in the English Tongue.

These Four by Michael Maittaire.

Sacerdotal Powers: Or the Necessity of Confession, Penance and Absolution; together with the Nullity of unauthorized Lay Baptism asserted. In an Essay, occasion'd by the Publication of two Sermons preach'd at Salisbury the 5<sup>th</sup> and 6<sup>th</sup> of November, 1710. By the Author of Lay Baptism invalid. To which is added a Letter to the said Author, wherein the Popish Doctrine of Lay-Baptism, taught in a Sermon said to have been preach'd by the B— of S— the 7<sup>th</sup> of Nov. 1710. is censur'd and condemn'd by the Greek Church;



Church; the Church of *England*; the Reformed abroad; and even by our *English* Presbyterian Sectaries. By *Tho. Brett*, D. D.

*Dr. Wells's* Controversial Treatises; in several Letters to a Dissenting Parishioner, and to *Mr. P. Dowley* a Dissenting Teacher. Collected and bound together in one Volume.

*Epistola ad Authorem Anonymum Libelli non ita pridem editi: cui Titulus stricturna breves in Epistolas*, D. D. *Genevensium & Oxoniensium*.

The Exposition given by my Lord Bishop of *Sarum*, of the second Article of our Religion examin'd.

A Vindication of the twenty third Article of the Church of *England*, from a late Exposition, ascribed to my Lord Bishop of *Sarum*.

*Dr. Sacheverel's* Collections of Passages in Defence of Passive Obedience, in Answer to the Articles of his Impeachment.

The Mitre and the Crown; or, A real Distinction between them. In a Letter to a Reverend Member of the Convocation.

The Representation of the present State of Religion, with regard to Infidelity, Heresy, Impiety, and Popery; drawn up and agreed to by both Houses of Convocation in *Ireland*, pursuant to Her Majesty's Command in Her Royal Licence. The Second Edition.

Sacred Biography, or, Scripture Characters. Illustrated in several Discourses. To which are added two Sermons preach'd before the University of *Oxford*. In the Years 1708 and 1709. By *Richard Theed*, M. A.

The Dissenters represented and condemn'd by themselves, on the Points of the occasion of their Ministry, the Constitution of their Churches, and their Separation from the Church of *England*. In a Letter to *Mr. D. W.* a Dissenting Teacher, to one of his Flock who went astray. Together with some farther Account of their Principles and Practices upon those Points.

An Answer to *Mr. de Fontenelle's* History of Oracles. Translated from the *French*. By a Priest of the Church of *England*. To which is prefix'd a Letter to the Translator. By the Reverend *George Hicke's*, D. D. In 2 Volumes.

A Treatise of the three Evils of the last Times. 1. The Sword, 2. The Pestilence. 3. The Famine, and of their Natural and Moral Causes. As also of the ensuing coming of Antichrist, according to the Notion of the ancient Fathers.

A Practical Exposition of the Church Catechism. In two Volumes. By *John Ollyffe*, Rector of *Dunton* in *Bucks*.

The True-Church-Man and Loyal Subject.

